The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXIX, No. 1 JULY, 1953

CONTENTS

Bishop McCormick ..... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 1

The Truth About the Holy Shroud. Part I
Edward A. Wuenschel, C.SS.R. 3

Orestes Brownson and the Motherhood of Mary
Edward Day, C.SS.R. 20

The Obligation of Professing the Faith. Part II
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 28

An Evaluation of the Konnersreuth Controversy. Part II
James H. Van der Veldt, O.F.M. 38

Quodlibetal Questions. Part III ..... *John K. Ryan* 58

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Problem of Overpopulation 64

Milk for Baptism 65

The Excision of Extra Organs 66

The Lawyer and Mass Bequests 67

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1953, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Solemn Baptism in a Private Home 67

Holy Saturday Ceremony 68

Holy Communion on Holy Saturday 68

Leonine Prayers 68

Ordo to be Followed 69

Papal Chamberlain Dress 69

Name of Which Bishop in Breviary *Preces?* 69

BOOK REVIEWS

Six Social Documents of His Holiness Pope Pius XII 70

Black Robes in Lower California, *by Peter Masten Dunne, S.J.* 71

EVERY CATHOLIC SCHOOL where HISTORY is taught
EVERY CATHOLIC LIBRARY
EVERY PRIEST
EVERY CATHOLIC interested in HISTORY

should be a regular subscriber to

The Catholic Historical Review

Official Organ of the American Catholic Historical Association

ARTICLES BY LEADING SCHOLARS HISTORICAL MISCELLANY
BOOK REVIEWS NOTES AND COMMENTS PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Recognized as the leading publication in its field. Published quarterly: January, April, July, October. Subscription rate: $5.00; single number $1.50.

Address:

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS
Washington 17, D. C.

BISHOP McCORMICK

On May 18 last the Most Reverend Patrick J. McCormick, Titular Bishop of Atenia, Auxiliary Bishop of Washington, and Rector Magnificus of The Catholic University of America, was called to his eternal reward. It is definitely fitting that his death and the sorrow it caused should be chronicled on the pages of *The American Ecclesiastical Review.*

Bishop McCormick first came to the University forty-nine years ago, when the institution was only fifteen years old. With the exception of the four years (1906-10) which he spent as Diocesan Superintendent of Schools in Hartford, the remainder of his life was destined to be spent in the service of the University. At the time of his death he was the senior cleric in point of service on our staff.

He was an excellent scholar and writer. His *History of Education*, first published in 1915, and revised in 1946 by his distinguished confrere, Dr. Francis P. Cassidy, has been one of the most important Catholic contributions to the field of pedagogical literature. For years he served as editor of *The Catholic Educational Review*, a journal which owes much of its reputation to his writings and his direction.

For many years also he served as Dean of the Catholic Sisters' College, an integral part of the University organization. In 1936 he became Vice-Rector of the University, and served as Acting Rector during the period intervening between the appointment of Bishop Ryan to the diocesan see of Omaha and the installation of Bishop Corrigan as the sixth Rector of the University.

He continued as Vice-Rector under Bishop Corrigan's administration. After his good friend's death in 1942, the then Msgr. McCormick served for the second time as Acting Rector of the University, until his own appointment as Rector became effective on March 1, 1943. On Sept. 21, of the Holy Year, 1950, he was consecrated Bishop at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception.

Handsome and dignified in appearance, quiet and even austere in temperament, he was an unforgettable figure in the life of the

University. During his regime some of the most important developments in the life of the institution were carried out. The esteem in which he was held by his associates is attested by the high offices he held in the Federation of Pontifical Universities.

It was during Bishop McCormick's rectorship that *The American Ecclesiastical Review* was finally transferred to the University. Dr. Heuser, the founder and the first editor of this periodical, had long ago decided that it should be domiciled here. The two editors he chose during his lifetime, Bishop Turner and Msgr. Kerby, were both professors here at the University. He had seen to it that the *Review* was administered by a board of trustees acting for the University.

The present editor and the staff of the *Review* were appointed by Bishop McCormick in November, 1943. Since January, 1944, this magazine has been edited at the University.

The November, 1949, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* was given over entirely to articles about the history of this periodical during the first sixty years of its existence. For that issue Bishop McCormick wrote a paper, "The University and the Review," a paper that manifested his own personal knowledge of the connection between these two institutions.

With the passing of Bishop McCormick, both the University and the *Review* mourn the loss of a great Bishop, a singularly endowed figure in the field of Catholic education, a genuine and solid scholar, and a true Christian gentleman.

May his soul rest in peace.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

CARDINAL MANNING ON THE PRIEST'S DEATH

The death of a fervent priest . . . may be sudden: it cannot be unprepared. His whole life is a preparation for death. S. Charles as he departed said, *Ecce venio,* but his whole life was a continual approach to God. . . . S. Hilarion said: "I have served a good Master for these seventy years; why should I be afraid to go and see Him?"

—Henry Edward Cardinal Manning in *The Eternal Priesthood* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1944), p. 285.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE HOLY SHROUD

Part I

Since 1898 the Holy Shroud of Turin has been a storm-center of controversy. Violently attacked and passionately defended, it has also been the subject of quiet, persistent research. Is this really the burial cloth of Christ? The two life-size figures that it bears, representing the front and the back of a tall, well-proportioned man, covered with wounds and blood, but revealed in the photograph of the Shroud as majestic in ignominy and indomitable in death—are these really the imprints of the Victim of Calvary? Men like N. Noguier de Malijay and Antonio Tonelli, Professors of Science at the Salesian Institute in Turin, and above all Paul Vignon, Professor of Biology at the Sorbonne and later at the Institut Catholique of Paris, dedicated themselves to a conscientious study of the fascinating problem, while awaiting the day when new light might bring a final solution.

It was at the exposition of the Shroud in 1931 that the decisive evidence was discovered. On that occasion Giuseppe Enrie made a series of superb photographs; and Vignon and Tonelli, among others, were able at last to examine the Shroud. Certain anticipations were not realized, and certain tentative conclusions had to be rejected. Instead, before the amazed eyes of the investigators there was displayed an array of luminous evidence that surpassed all expectations. Clearly, these were the imprints of a human corpse, and the imprints formed the image of a man who bore all the identifying marks of the Christ of Calvary.

The attention of the scientific world was focussed more intensely on that mysterious sheet of linen, and one by one scientists, medical men, scholars in every field, surrendered to the mute testimony of the Shroud. The roster of the French and the Italian Commission of the Holy Shroud is assurance enough that one need not be a credulous devotee to accept this as the true winding-sheet of the Saviour with the imprints of His martyred body.

Pope Pius XI may be regarded as the most eminent spokesman of the many scholars and scientists who have frankly avowed

their conviction of the authenticity of the Shroud. On one occasion, referring to the imprints, he made the following carefully measured statement:

> The Holy Shroud of Turin is still mysterious, but it is certainly not the work of any human hand. This, one can now say, is demonstrated. We said mysterious, because that sacred object still involves many problems, but certainly it is more sacred than perhaps any other; and, as is now established in the most positive manner, even apart from any idea of faith or Christian piety, it is certainly not a human work.[1]

On another occasion, declaring that he spoke as a scholar and not as Pope, His Holiness said: "We have personally followed the studies on the Holy Shroud, and We are convinced of its authenticity. Objections have been made, but they are worthless."[2]

About 1935 a new voice was heard among the advocates of the Shroud—that of Rudolf W. Hynek, a physician of Prague and a Catholic recently returned to the Faith of his youth. He devoted himself particularly to the medical aspects of the imprints, though he treated the question of the Shroud also from other points of view—the scriptural, the historical, the artistic. He wrote on the subject with extraordinary zeal, his many books and articles being widely circulated and translated into several languages, including the Japanese. Frequently quoted, he came to be regarded as a leading authority on the Shroud of Turin.[3]

[1] *L'Osservatore Romano*, Sept. 7-8, 1936.

[2] M. Card. Fossati, "Pio XI e la Santa Sindone," *La Santa Sindone nelle ricerche moderne* (Torino: L.I.C.E., R. Berruti e C., 2nd ed., 1950), p. 16. This volume contains the Acta of the National Sindonological Congress held in Turin in 1939.

[3] Dr. Hynek died in Prague, on June 28, 1952, bringing to an end an industrious literary career in connection with the Shroud of Turin. Recently his writings on the Shroud have been much discussed especially in Germany, where the subject is known mainly through translations of Dr. Hynek's works. In academic and clerical circles his defense of the authenticity of the Shroud has served on the whole to confirm a skeptical reserve or to provoke a decided opposition. The readers of this *Review* need not be told that there is immensely more involved than the genuineness of a relic. This article, therefore, is all the more timely as an appraisal of Dr. Hynek's voluminous output, which includes at least 43 works, with translations in 13 languages, published in 17 different countries.

Among the students of the Shroud, however, there were those who had their misgivings. The very nature of the subject and the state of the controversy demanded precise knowledge and a rigorously scientific spirit in one who pretended to do more than popularize the work of others. In this respect, Dr. Hynek's writings left something to be desired. Not sufficiently familiar with the earlier phase of the controversy or with the more important literature, much of which is rare, he made statements which had already been proved to be false, and received hypotheses which had been abandoned as untenable. He was also fertile in theories of his own, and these he put forth with an assurance not warranted by his arguments.

Misgivings deepened when it was noted that Dr. Hynek's style of treating the subject provided ammunition for opponents and engendered a skeptical attitude on the part of critical readers. One need not have any special knowledge of the Shroud to detect historical errors, improbable hypotheses, bad logic, or to see discrepancies between statements of the author and details visible in the photos of the Shroud. I myself have been put to the trouble of answering inquiries and objections from readers of Dr. Hynek. I have also heard scoffing at belief in the authenticity of the Shroud because of his errors and exaggerations.

Just recently Fr. Damasus Zaehringer, a Benedictine of Beuron, made capital of the fact that many who write on the Shroud draw from the fountain of Dr. Hynek, who, he says, is faulty in method, puts forth arbitrary opinions in place of proof, and in treating historical questions is irresponsible, one-sided and uncritical.[4] In an earlier article Fr. Zaehringer had already scored Dr. Hynek for a lack of critical judgment and a tendency to one-sidedness and exaggeration.[5] He himself seems to be one who is confirmed in his opposition to the Shroud by Dr. Hynek's failings—not a very striking proof of critical judgment on his part.

Not long before his death, Dr. Hynek published another book on the Shroud (*The True Likeness*), this time in English under the egis of Sheed and Ward.[6] In their *Own Trumpet* the publishers

[4] Damasus Zaehringer, "Das Turiner Grabtuch," *Benediktinische Monatschrift*, XXVII (1951), 227, 230.

[5] *Ibid.*, XXVI (1950), 150.

[6] As I was completing this article, I received a copy of another book by Dr.

proclaimed him as "one of the leading sindonological experts of Europe, who has sifted all the accumulations of evidence that are to hand." They assured their clients that "he sets out the evidence of both sides with great impartiality and precision"; and that the reader "is unlikely to find, anywhere, a fuller and clearer assemblage of the facts."

In an advertisement of one of their works of fiction, the publishers themselves ask with characteristic humor: "What on earth is the matter with Sheed and Ward?" Nothing serious, I hope. Perhaps it is only that in this case the usually judicious publishers were too trustful. One can safely rely on the evidence for the authenticity of the Shroud, discovered and verified by other sindonologists and now become the common patrimony of all students of the subject, but that is something quite different from the personal views of Dr. Hynek.

This latest book—a thin volume of 96 pages—was presented as a translation of the author's *Muz Bolesti* (*Man of Sorrows*), but it is at most a summary of the two-volume Czech work, which totals 509 pages. Unfortunately, it is also a summary of Dr. Hynek's views on the principal aspects of the Shroud, expressed over and over again in his preceding works.

To me, it seems ironical that I should be writing this judgment on the late Dr. Hynek's book, which is really a judgment on all his writings on the Shroud. It is the second time I am doing the task. The first time was in private correspondence with Dr. Hynek himself through the year 1937. In a friendly spirit of cooperation, I then submitted to him all the criticisms and corrections I am about to present here. I informed him of the latest unpublished results of research by members of the Commission of the Holy Shroud. I shared with him a valuable collection of references, particularly with regard to the history of the Shroud, Jewish burial customs, the Veil of Veronica, and his own theory of the cause of the death of Christ. I gave him a detailed criticism (again documented) of his first major work on the Shroud,[7]

Hynek which must have been published about the same time: *Das Goettliche Antlitz* (Karlsruhe: Badenia Verlag, 1951). It contains nothing new.

[7] R. W. Hynek, *Golgotha. Wissenschaft und Mystik. Eine medizinisch-apologetische Studie ueber das heilige Grablinnen von Turin* (Karlsruhe: Badenia Verlag, 1936).

which contains about everything he has written since. In the end, I had the interesting experience of seeing all this material—not personal opinion, but facts either observable on the Shroud or attested by good authorities—completely ignored, and the same old errors and baseless hypotheses persistently repeated.

This is the first time I have published anything in criticism of what Dr. Hynek wrote. I do so with profound regret, and with sincere regard for Dr. Hynek himself. But it now seems to be high time to set matters straight, lest the truth about the Shroud and the hard-won fruit of the labors of others be compromised in England and America, as they have already been compromised in other lands.

THE ILLUSTRATIONS

First, something must be said about the reproductions of the photos of the Shroud, since these photos are indispensable for any critical study of the imprints. According to Sheed and Ward's *Own Trumpet*, "the reader is unlikely to find, anywhere, . . . a more striking documentation than the twenty-six photographs here reproduced." The ad writer never saw the original photos, or the excellent reproductions in the works of Enrie, Barnes, Barbet or Vignon.

Of the reproductions in Dr. Hynek's book, only the first one can be considered good. This is the negative photo which represents the imposing positive version of the face. The corresponding positive photo, which represents the face as it is on the Shroud (a negative image), has a smudged appearance and fails to give a clear idea of the delicate, shadowy stain and the exact details which have convinced experts that this is an imprint and not a work of human art.

The illustrations which represent the frontal and the dorsal figure, and those which reproduce the Shroud in its entirety are too dim to have much meaning. The same is true of most of the reproductions of detail photos. The reason seems to be that the illustrations are printed on absorbent, uncoated stock which cannot receive precise impressions of what is most characteristic of the Shroud. Readers who refuse to be guided by the publisher's ad may wonder how on earth anybody can make the staggering claims based on the original photos.

Speaking of illustrations, why did Sheed and Ward illustrate their own advertisement with a reproduction of the photo of the Shroud taken in 1898? This photo is defective because of poor lighting, uneven stretching of the cloth, and the fact that the Shroud was covered with glass. As the first revealing photo which brought the question of the Shroud into the laboratory and the halls of science, it has great documentary value. For the rest, however, it has been completely superseded by the much more perfect photos taken in 1931.

As one goes through the text, one becomes aware that the author is rather chary of references. There are just a few citations embedded in the text, and these are too indefinite or too incomplete to be any help to those who may wish to verify the author's statements or to read more on the subject. Not even when he quotes directly does he give satisfactory references. Neither is there any bibliography. To know what authorities, or supposed authorities, he relies upon, one must go to his other works.

The book as a whole teems with errors of detail, like a vineyard infested with a horde of little foxes. I pass these over and comment only on points of major importance.

Dr. Hynek begins with a description of the Shroud, in which there are three points to be noted. The first concerns the design in which the Shroud is woven.

THE WEAVE OF THE SHROUD

The Shroud is woven in a twill design, with converging diagonals forming stripes in the herring-bone pattern. Dr. Hynek quotes Virginio Timossi, a textile expert of Turin, to the effect that it is a 2:2 twill, that is, that the weft thread passes alternately over and under two threads of the warp. There is no reference, but apparently the quotation is taken from Enrie.[8] Timossi himself, however, states repeatedly that it is a 3:1 twill, that is, that the weft thread passes alternately over three threads and under one of the warp.[9] Vignon and Barnes give the same

[8] Giuseppe Enrie, *La Santa Sindone rivelata dalla fotografia* (Torino: Societa Editrice Internazionale, 2nd ed., 1938), p. 68.

[9] Virginio Timossi, *La Santa Sindone nella sua costituzione tessile* (Torino: L.I.C.E., R. Berruti e C., 1933), p. 69, diagrams on pp. 65, 66. To p. 55 is at-

analysis. It was confirmed by several technicians whom I consulted at the textile works in Wappingers Falls, N.Y. It is really not very difficult for anyone to see the 3:1 twill in the photo in which the surface of the cloth is magnified seven times directly from the Shroud.

Now this is no negligible detail. It has been objected that a complicated design like that of the Shroud surpassed the skill of the weavers who plied their primitive hand-looms at the beginning of the Christian era. Like so many other objections, this one has been put forward without knowledge of the facts; but it involves the question of the authenticity of the Shroud, so it must be answered, and an intelligent answer demands that the design be correctly analyzed.

Our knowledge of the art of weaving in the ancient Orient is derived mostly from a study of Egyptian mummy wrappings, which are preserved in great quantities and in excellent condition. There are no comparable Jewish fabrics that date from anywhere near the time of Christ. This is because the Jews did not mummify their dead, but left them to decompose in the tomb, with the result that the graveclothes were invariably destroyed. We know, however, that the Jewish weavers were not inferior to the Egyptian. They learned the art in Egypt during the Captivity and developed it to a high state of perfection.[10] There were those, in fact, who preferred fabrics of Jewish workmanship to the products of Egypt.[11] It was precisely about the beginning of the Christian era that the art of weaving reached its highest development in the Near East, including Syria and Palestine, where there were great centers of the textile industry.[12] We need not hesitate, therefore, to consider the skilled Jewish weavers of that period capable of the best that is revealed by the extant Egyptian fabrics.

---

tached an exact replica of the fabric of the Shroud. "Analisi del tessuto della Sindone," *La Santa Sindone nelle ricerche moderne* (1950), p. 106.

[10] Adolf Rosenzweig, *Kleidung und Schmuck im biblischen und talmudischen Schrifttum* (Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1905), pp. 24-34, 42; H. F. Lutz, *Textiles and Costumes among the Peoples of the Ancient Near East* (New York: G. E. Stechert and Co., 1923), p. 67.

[11] H. F. Lutz, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 71; L. E. Start, *Coptic Cloths* (Bankfield Museum Notes, 2nd series, no. 4, 1914), p. 7.

The following are the principal facts that interest us. Twill weaving was already well developed as early as 1500 B.C. Specimens dating from this and the following centuries are woven in almost every proportion of warp and weft and in many complicated patterns, the simplest of which are chevrons and squares.

August Braulik examined more than three hundred of a rich collection of Egyptian fabrics and gave a minute technical description of their various designs. His findings were confirmed by C. Heinrich Loebner from a study of mummy cloths in the Berlin Museum. I note just a few of the more significant specimens.

In a wrapping of the mummy of King Thutmes II, of the 18th Dynasty (c. 1450 B.C.), a stripe in plain weave alternates with a stripe in 4:1 twill.[13] A scarf of the Twenty-first or the Twenty-second Dynasty (1110-960 B.C.) has a similar design.[14] A scarf from among the burial garments of King Seti I, of the Nineteenth Dynasty (1300 B.C.), is woven in stripes of 2:2 and 3:3 twill, with a border in 1:2 and 1:3.[15] From the tomb of Queen Makeri, of the Twenty-first Dynasty (1100 B.C.), comes a fabric in 1:3 twill, with a border in 1:10.[16] Of the same period we have the mummy cloth of the Highpriest Nessita-neb-Ashir, in which a stripe in plain weave is followed by a stripe in 1:2 twill and another in 1:3. The border is in 1:6.[17]

A very striking specimen is the linen girdle of Rameses III (1200 B.C.) at the Liverpool Museum. Seventeen feet long, it tapers evenly from five inches in width to one and seven-eighths inches. It is woven with threads of five colors in a design composed of a 3:1 twill alternating with 4:1 and 5:1.[18] The compli-

[13] A. Braulik, "Altaegyptische Weberei," *Dinglers Polytechnisches Journal*, CCCXI (1899), 13, fig. 2.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 30, fig. 14.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 31, fig. 22; *Altaegyptische Gewebe* (Stuttgart: A. Bergstraesser, 1900), p. 15, fig. 22. So far as the disposition of the threads in the frame and the operation of the loom are concerned, the 1: 3 and the 3: 1 twill are identical. Once the simplest form of twill (1: 2 or 2: 1) was mastered, there was no particular difficulty in weaving in any practicable proportion of warp and weft, or in varying the pattern of the fabric.

[16] A. Braulik, *Altaegyptische Gewebe*, p. 8.

[17] *Ibid.*, fig. 27, *op. cit.* in *Dinglers Polytechnisches Journal*, p. 13, fig. 3; p. 46, fig. 53.

[18] Ling Roth, *Ancient Egyptian and Greek Looms* (Bankfield Museum Notes, 2nd series, no. 2, 1913), pp. 24, 84-96, figs. 6, 7, 9, 10.

cated structure of the fabric and the excellent workmanship are convincing proof of the great skill of Egyptian weavers twelve centuries before Christ, and lead Roth to conclude that the loom was at that time more highly developed than was hitherto believed.

Twilled fabrics of the Greco-Roman period were discovered at Palmyra and Dura-Europos, among them specimens similar in design to the Shroud.[19] The Musée Guimet in Paris possesses a number of cushions from Antinoe woven in complicated twill patterns. One of these has a border in which chevrons are formed with a 3:1 twill, which is the design of the Shroud.[20] It was really a simple matter for the craftsmen of that period to weave in that design. Neither is there any difficulty about the dimensions of the Shroud. Much longer and wider fabrics were woven with the ancient looms.

The most conservative dating of the oldest mummy cloths (2000 B.C.) makes it appear rather absurd to object that the Shroud could not have been preserved for nineteen centuries. Made of unbleached linen, one of the most durable of the textile fibers and particularly resistant to moisture, the fabric of the Shroud is rendered still more durable by the firm, compact twill weaving.

On the occasion of the first international sindonological congress held in Rome, May 1-4, 1950, and continued in Turin, May 5-6, J. F. Flanagan wrote in a letter to the London *Tablet* of May 6, 1950: "Where is there an example of linen cloth in the herringbone twill weave that was in use in the Eastern Mediterranean in the time of Our Lord? If the scholars who are discussing the Shroud in Rome can point to any such example it will be useful evidence . . . " (p. 367).

In reply another correspondent sent in two quotations from Dr. Hynek's then latest book on the Shroud.[21] The first is a rather free translation of the passage cited above from Enrie. (I refer to Dr. Hynek's German translation of Enrie, not the

[19] Paul Vignon, *Le Saint Suaire de Turin devant la science, l'archéologie, l'histoire, l'iconographie, la logique* (Paris: Masson et Cie, 2nd ed., 1939), p. 80.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[21] *The Tablet*, May 27, 1950, p. 426; R. W. Hynek, *Golgotha im Zeugnis des Turiner Grabtuches* (Karlsruhe: Badenia Verlag, 1950), pp. 23, 42.

editor's English translation of Dr. Hynek.) In the second, Dr. Hynek writes:

> The most impressive refutation of this objection [that the diagonal twill weave in the herring-bone pattern was not known before the Middle Ages, and hence that the Shroud of Turin could not have been produced before Gothic times] . . . is to be found in the latest edition of Vignon's book of 1938. On page 79, fig. 32, there is reproduced a photograph taken by Professor Maiuri, of the Museum of Pompeii, showing a textile discovered at Pompeii which is identical with the linen of Turin.

The correspondent asks: "Would Mr. J. F. Flanagan consider the above as useful evidence?"

Well, if Mr. Flanagan looked up fig. 32 in Vignon's book, with the accompanying text, he found that the cloth discovered at Pompeii—which, by the way, is not in the Eastern Mediterranean area—is not at all identical with the Shroud. It is a coarse fabric woven in a simple 2:2 twill without any diagonals, not a 3:1 twill in the herring-bone pattern. Dr. Hynek considers it "the most impressive refutation" of the objection he attempts to meet because he is completely mistaken about the design of the Shroud.

A sufficient answer to Mr. Flanagan's inquiry is given above. The textile question was not even discussed at the congress in Rome because it is considered to be definitely settled.

THE WATER-STAINS

The second point to be noted in Dr. Hynek's description of the Shroud concerns the water-stains caused in 1532, when the Shroud was threatened with destruction by fire. Through the middle of the long sheet there is a series of six (not five) stains which have, roughly, the shape of lozenges. Along each side of the sheet there is a corresponding series of half-lozenges. Of these stains Dr. Hynek writes:

> A strange fact is that the places thus marked are those which remained dry, untouched by the water which soaked the rest of the Shroud. This very odd fact has been established beyond all doubt by chemical experiment. The proof is this: the aloes impregnating the Shroud, affected by the ammonia from the body, produced two coloured substances—aloetin and aloin. It is the pinkish-brown tint of aloetin—

indissoluble in water—that forms the basis of the imprints on the Shroud. Aloin, on the other hand, dissolves in water, and as a result of the soaking its colour deepened after the fire, making the outline of the body clearer and more distinct. The lozenges and half-lozenges which I have described above escaped the water and consequently remained dull and indistinct (pp. 3-4).

There is some bad chemistry in that statement and a misconception of the significance of experiments performed by the scientist Fr. Pietro Scotti.[22] There is also a glaring contradiction with what Dr. Hynek says elsewhere about the genesis of the imprints. Beyond that, the obvious fact is that the very opposite happened from what he imagines—the lozenge-shaped areas were moistened, while the rest of the cloth remained dry. This is in accord with the manner in which the Shroud was folded at the time, and it is proved "beyond all doubt" by three facts observable on the Shroud.

First, the serrated edges of the water-stains are evidently formed of foreign particles which were carried outward by capillary attraction from within the lozenges. It must have been these parts, therefore, that were moistened.

Secondly, the half-lozenges along the edges of the Shroud are separated from the imprints by a vacant space. Hence, they could not have been formed by the dissolution of the aloin, which is probably one of the components of the imprints. Incidentally, those parts of the imprints which are occupied by the lozenges are not noticeably more dull and indistinct than the rest of the imprints.

Thirdly, water soaking the entire Shroud would certainly have dissolved the blood encrusted on the cloth—much more readily than it is supposed to have dissolved the aloin. Those transfers of blood could not have retained that astounding exactness which enables investigators to observe how the clot separated from the serum, and to distinguish venous blood from arterial, and living blood from blood that issued after death. Dr. Hynek himself emphasizes these cardinal points in the demonstration of the authenticity of the Shroud, but he seems to have forgotten them

[22] Pietro Scotti, "Le impronte della S. Sindone e le recenti ricerche della chimica," *La Santa Sindone nelle ricerche moderne* (1950), pp. 73-93.

while theorizing about the formation of the wholly irrelevant water-stains.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE IMPRINTS

Finally, in his description of the Shroud Dr. Hynek writes: "The imprints are formed by closely pressed granules, whose deep colouring is due to the chemical action of the body on the myrrh and aloes with which the Shroud had been covered" (p. 5).

This again contradicts what Dr. Hynek maintains as the true explanation of the genesis of the imprints. What I wish to note now is the statement that the imprints are formed by "closely pressed granules." This will surprise anyone who has the opportunity to examine the positive photos of the Shroud, especially that of the face in natural size. Apart from the blood and the marks of wounds, they show that the imprints consist of a continuous, mistlike stain, completely penetrating the threads of the fabric and gradually fading away. This is the reason why the negative photos reveal such a finely shaded, well-modelled image. Closely pressed granules could never have given such an effect.

N. Noguier de Malijay had the same concept of the composition of the imprints,[23] but in his case it was quite pardonable. He could study only the one defective photo of 1898, which does suggest something like small particles forming the imprints. Tonelli also held the granular theory, but he promptly rejected it after he had seen the Shroud and the new photos.[24] Dr. Hynek does not yet see why the error should be corrected.

THE HISTORY OF THE SHROUD

The history of the Shroud is the one aspect of the question in which little progress has been made. Almost complete darkness still envelopes the first thirteen and a half centuries, and thereafter the historian is still confronted with some thorny problems. One would not think so after reading Dr. Hynek's chapter "Short History of the Shroud." This, the publishers say, is "the historical documentation of the Shroud—which is far more impressive than one would have thought."

[23] N. Noguier de Malijay, *Le Saint-Suaire de Turin* (Paris: Editions Spes, 1929), p. 51.

[24] Antonio Tonelli, *La Santa Sindone. Esame Oggettivo* (Torino: Societa Editrice Internazionale, 1931), p. 63.

One can hardly say that the author gives any documentation at all. In the whole chapter there are just two citations, and these were better omitted. One is only the title of a book without even a page reference, cited in support of a very doubtful theory. The other refers to a document inaccurately titled by Dr. Hynek and worthless from a historical point of view. Nevertheless Dr. Hynek asserts that one of Canon Chevalier's arguments against the Shroud of Turin is "completely undermined" by this one document (p. 9). Still, the assured manner in which he relates the "history" of the shroud must indeed be impressive to readers not familiar with the controversy that has raged over this question, or with the careful sifting of the evidence by Abbé Paul Ecole, of Troyes;[25] by Paul Vignon, who, till the time of his death, was the greatest of sindonologists;[26] by Mons. Joseph Roserot de Melin, Vicar General of Troyes, who presented the results of his study at the Congress in Rome;[27] and Mons. Pietro Savio, Archivist of the Secret Archives of the Vatican, also one of the speakers at the Congress.[28]

Recent research has had at least this useful result—it has determined more precisely the historical value of certain sources hitherto invoked, and has eliminated certain unfounded theories about the career of the Shroud through the centuries till it arrived at Lirey, France, about the middle of the fourteenth century—the point at which a continuous recorded history begins.

There is, for example, the alleged testimony of St. Nino, cited as follows by Dr. Hynek: "It is not until after the edict of Milan that we first hear of the Shroud as being greatly venerated in Jerusalem. This early mention of it we owe to St. Nino, an Armenian princess, who died in A.D. 338" (p. 8). Later (p. 27) he

[25] Paul Ecole, *Autour du Saint-Suaire de Lirey* (Domois par Ouges: Imprimerie de l'Union Typographique, 1933).

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 95-111.

[27] Joseph Roserot de Melin, *Le fait de Lirey confronté à celui de Turin.* A résumé in Italian appears in *La Santa Sindone nelle ricerche moderne* (Torino: L.I.C.E., R. Berruti e C., 1951), pp. 33-34. This volume contains summaries of all the addresses given at the International Sindonological Congress held in Rome and Turin in 1950. It was published as an appendix to the Acts of the national congress held in Turin in 1939, cited above under the same title.

[28] Pietro Savio, "Alcuni documenti sopra la Santa Sindone," *La Santa Sindone nelle ricerche moderne* (1951), pp. 34-36.

again introduces St. Nino in connection with the origin of the traditional Christ-type in art.

Now here is what is really contained in the *Life of St. Nino:*

> And they found the linen early in Christ's tomb, whither Pilate and his wife came. When they found it, Pilate's wife asked for the linen, and went away quickly to her house in Pontus, and she became a believer in Christ. Some time afterwards, the linen came into the hands of Luke the Evangelist, who put it into a place known only to himself. Now they did not find the shroud *(sudari),* but it is said to have been found by Peter, who took it and kept it, but we know not if it has ever been discovered.[29]

There is nothing, then, about the Shroud being greatly venerated in Jerusalem early in the fourth century. On the contrary, the text states that it was not known whether the Shroud was ever found again, after Peter had reputedly taken it away for safekeeping.

However, it would make no difference even if the text contained all that Dr. Hynek ascribes to it. The *Life of St. Nino* was written more than six centuries after the death of the Saint, and appears in at least five different forms which bear all the earmarks of legend. A semi-poetic romance is the verdict of the Bollandist Paul Peeters.[30]

Dr. Hynek quotes the fourteenth-century historian Nicephorus Callistus as saying that the Empress Pulcheria placed the burial linens of Christ in the church of Our Lady of Blachernes, a suburb of Constantinople, and he supposes that the Shroud now at Turin was among these cloths. Nicephorus Callistus really

[29] *Life of Saint Nino,* translated from the Georgian by M. and J. O. Wardrop, in *Studia biblica et ecclesiastica,* V, Part 1, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900), 10. A variant form in Armenian was translated by F. C. Conybeare, *ibid.,* p. 71. The same texts had already been translated into the French by M. F. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au XIXe siècle* (St. Petersbourg: Imprimerie de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences, 1849-56), I, 93; II, 20.

[30] Paul Peeters, "Les debuts du christianisme en Géorgie d'après les sources hagiographiques," *Analecta Bollandiana,* L (1932), 5-58. See also Michel Tamarati, *L'église géorgienne des origines jusqu'a nos jours* (Rome, 1910), pp. 160, 179, 190; Alban Butler, *The Lives of the Saints,* revised and amplified by Herbert Thurston and Donald Attwater (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1938), pp. 173-75.

says that in 438 A.D. Pulcheria placed the *entaphia spargana* (burial bands or wrappings) of the Blessed Virgin in that church, and the *spargana* (swaddling-clothes) of Christ in the church of Our Lady of the Guides.[31] Dr. Hynek, however, continues intrepidly: "St. Braulio and Bishop Arculf in the seventh century, and St. John Damascene in the eighth century, all speak of it [the Shroud] as still being there [at Our Lady of Blachernes]" (p. 8).

Not one of these authors makes the remotest reference to the Shroud as being at Constantinople. St. Braulio, Bishop of Saragossa, only expresses his belief that the Shroud was preserved.[32] St. John Damascene mentions the Shroud along with the relics like the cross, the sponge, the lance, as being worthy of special veneration, but he gives no clue as to where it might have been.[33] Arculf, Bishop of Périgueux, France, relates that he saw in Jerusalem a cloth eight feet long, venerated as the *sudarium* which had been upon the Head of Christ in the tomb.[34] The Shroud of Turin is about fourteen feet three inches long, and Jerusalem is not Constantinople.

It is utterly futile, therefore, for Dr. Hynek to speculate as follows: "We do not know if the Shroud remained continuously in Constantinople throughout that period, or whether it was taken for a time to Jerusalem, and thence, before the destruction of the city in the seventh century, to the capital of the Persian king Chosroes" (p. 8).

The fact is that we do not know where the Shroud was throughout that period, or when it was brought to Constantinople. Our first eye-witnesses attest its presence there in 1171 and 1201, and in 1203 we have the first clear reference to the imprints. The Crusader Robert de Clari testifies that the Shroud in which the Saviour was enveloped was then in the church of Our Lady of

[31] *Nicephori Callisti ecclesiasticae historiae*, lib. XIV, cap. II (*MPG*, CXLVI, 106); lib. XV, cap. XIV (*MPG*, CXLVII, 43).

[32] *Epistola 42 ad Taium* (*MPL*, LXXX, 689).

[33] *De imaginibus oratio III* (*MPG*, XLVII, 647).

[34] *Adamnani de locis sanctis libri tres*, lib. I, cap. IX, edited by Paul Geyer, *Itinera hierosolymitana saeculi IIII-VIII* (*CSEL*, XXXIX, 235-38).

Blachernes, and that every Friday "it was stretched upright so that one could clearly see the figure of Our Lord."[35]

The following year the Shroud vanished during the sack of the imperial capital by the Crusaders. "No one," continues Robert de Clari, "neither Greek nor Frank, knows what became of the Shroud when the city was taken." About a century and a half later it appeared in Lirey, France. This was certainly the present Shroud of Turin, but how did it come to Lirey?

Dom François Chamard, Prior of the Abbey of St. Martin in Ligugé, proposed a theory which has been generally accepted among defenders of the Shroud of Turin.[36] According to this theory, the relic of Constantinople came into the possession of the cathedral of Besançon and remained there till 1349, when the cathedral was destroyed by fire. During the conflagration the Shroud is supposed to have been stolen and given to Geoffrey de Charny, who placed it in a church founded by himself at Lirey. To assure himself of permanent possession, says Dom Chamard, de Charny had a painted copy of the frontal imprint made, and this he palmed off on the cathedral chapter of Besançon, which is supposed to have accepted without suspicion a crude caricature of just half the Shroud.

Dr. Hynek still accepts this theory. He has not profited by the searching investigation made by Vignon with the scientific detachment and the untiring persistence of a scholar determined to track down the truth.[37] Vignon has shown that Chamard's theory has no historical foundation. It is a conjecture based upon documents that are non-existent, or irrelevant, or late and unreliable. Moreover, Vignon's inquiry at Besançon revealed the surprising fact that there is no evidence of any "shroud" being there before 1523. These findings were confirmed by Canon

[35] C. H. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes inédites ou peu connues* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1873), p. 71. Eugenio Valentini ("Nuovi documenti sulla S. Sindone," *Salesianum*, XX [1942], 76-83) has shown from documents hitherto little known that there was a popular belief in the West before the beginning of the thirteenth century that the Shroud of Christ existed with the complete imprint of His body. It is particularly significant that this tradition was current in the West prior to the testimony of Robert de Clari.

[36] François Chamard, *Le Linceul du Christ. Etude critique et historique* (Paris: H. Oudin, 1902), pp. 38-56.

[37] *Op. cit.*, pp. 105-108.

Mennie, Chancellor of the archiepiscopal curia of Besançon, in a communication to the congress at Rome, declaring that there are no documents which attest the passage of the Shroud through Besançon.[38]

Until something more satisfactory may be found, we must register another blank in the history of the Shroud. For the present, we do not know how the Shroud came to Lirey.

(To be continued)

EDWARD A. WUENSCHEL, C.SS.R.

Collegium Maius S. Alfonsi
Rome

[38] *La Santa Sindone nelle ricerche moderne* (1951), p. 57. In the permanent exhibit at the seat of the *Cultores Sanctae Sindonis* in Turin there is an autograph letter of His Eminence Card. Henri Binet, Archbishop of Besançon, which, in substance, affirms the thesis of Dom Chamard. This letter was written before Vignon and Canon Mennie made their researches, the results of which can hardly be questioned unless some positive historical evidence be produced in favor of the sojourn of the Shroud in Besançon.

ST. AUGUSTINE AND THE OMNIPRESENCE OF GOD

St. Augustine begins his discussion of the divine omnipresence by cautioning Dardanus to eradicate from his mind all carnal concepts of God's presence everywhere, lest he think that God is diffused throughout all things as matter, liquid, air, or light. God is rather present everywhere as wisdom. Thus if two men are equally wise but of different bodily stature, wisdom is not greater in the larger man nor less in the smaller one, nor less in one than in both, but wisdom is in the smaller person as much as in the larger one and to the same extent in either one as it is in both. The Bishop of Hippo brings out his point still more forcibly by another comparison, contrasting a corporeal body, which is quantitative, with health which is a quality. A corporeal body, pertaining to quantity, is less in small parts and more in larger parts; nor can it be entire in every individual part. On the other hand health, which is a quality of the body, is the same in the larger parts of the body as it is in the smaller ones since the whole body is healthy, the small parts not being less healthy than the large ones.

—Adrian Fuerst, O.S.B., *The Omnipresence of God* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1951), pp. 4-5.

ORESTES BROWNSON AND THE MOTHERHOOD OF MARY

It was in 1853, when spiritualism was rife in Boston, that Dr. Orestes Brownson chose to set down the Church's teaching on the Mother of God. The occasion was not fortuitous. While sneering at the "mariolatry" of their Catholic chambermaids, Boston's best families saw nothing incongruous in straining the silence of a seance for the tappings of spirits from the great beyond. *Rappomania* was sweeping New England and, as an editorial in *The Boston Pilot* stated, "scarcely a village can be found which is not infested with it."[1]

But it was not the "credulous Catholics," with their beads and Blessed Virgin, who were taken in by the medium. Because they said their rosaries and kept their devotion to Mary "the Irish (serving) girls behave nobly, they laugh at the ignorance and superstition of their silly employers."[2] With this idea in mind, Brownson set out to develop, in his clear and vigorous style, the place of God's Mother in the plan of Redemption, and, consequently, in the lives of the redeemed. For

> . . . as the worship of Mary is the best preservative from idolatry, heresy, and unbelief, so is it the best preservative from superstition. . . . Her devout children will not be found among those who call up the spirits of the dead, and seek to be placed in communication with devils. . . . Demon-worship is undeniably reviving in the modern Protestant world . . . and there is no room to doubt that it is owing to the abandonment of the worship of Mary, which carries along with it the abandonment of the worship of her Son, the Incarnate God. Where Mary is not loved and honored, Christ is not worshipped. . . . The first symptom of apostasy from Christ and of a lapse into heathenism is the neglect of the worship of his most Holy Mother, and a rejection of that worship as superstition or idolatry; because that involves a rejection of the Incarnation, which comprises in itself all Christianity.[3]

[1] Herbert Thurston, S.J., *The Church and Spiritualism* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1933), p. 49.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

[3] Orestes A. Brownson, "The Love of Mary," *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, Third Series, I (1853), 229.

Fundamentally, there can only be one justification for the veneration of Mary: it is in accordance with the designs of the most Holy Trinity. In the plan of divine Providence the Incarnation of the Second Person of the Trinity was the essential condition of the deification of mankind through the gift of sanctifying grace. A Hebrew maiden, Mary of Nazareth, was God's chosen instrument in forming and presenting His great Gift to men, the Incarnate Word. Only those who do not believe that God really "emptied Himself" and "did not shrink from the Virgin's womb" can gainsay the honor the Trinity has bestowed upon her.

The special honor Catholics pay to Mary follows as a natural consequence of the Incarnation. "If you concede the Incarnation, you must concede that Mary is the Mother of God. If you deny that she is the Mother of God, you must deny the Incarnation."[4] A convert from the barreness of Unitarianism, Brownson's faith was dynamically Christo-centric.

> In the Incarnation God assumes human nature, becomes man without ceasing to be God, and so assumes human nature that he becomes from the moment of the Incarnation as truly human as he is Divine, perfect man as well as perfect God. It is not that a perfect man is united to perfect God, but that perfect God becomes himself really perfect man, in such sort that the human nature is as truly the nature of the Divine Person or Word, as is the Divine nature itself.[5]

There were not two Christs, one human, the other divine, each merely united to the other by a bond of common purpose. This was the error of Nestorius, an error that has slipped into Protestantism to put all its belief awry.

> But the true doctrine of the Incarnation, which we must admit, if we admit any real incarnation at all, is, that the human and Divine natures are united, without being confounded, in one Divine Person. . . . The human nature of Christ is not human nature divested of personality; it is a person as much as is the human nature of Peter or John, but its person is Divine, not human,—the eternal person of the Divine nature of Christ.[6]

[4] Brownson, "The Worship of Mary," *ibid.*, p. 11.
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

How God can lower Himself to become the Person of a human nature is a mystery no mere mortal can fathom. That he did is evident to anyone familiar with the Gospel.

> Now God in his human nature is literally and truly the Son of Mary. . . . Human nature cannot exist without a personality, and the human nature of Christ, therefore, was not and could not have been generated without his Divine personality. Then that which was conceived in the womb of Mary and born of her was the Divine Person assuming to himself flesh, or the nature of man, therefore God. . . . Mary is none the less the mother of God because his mother only in his human nature, for the human nature of which she is the mother is the human nature of God.[7]

God can as truly call Mary "mother" as any son acknowledging the woman who gave him flesh.

If God has so honored this woman, who are men to gainsay Him? As St. John warns: "No spirit which would disunite Jesus comes from God. This is the power of the Antichrist."[8] We cannot dissect Christ and honor Him only in His divine nature. "He is one Christ, not two, one human, the other Divine,—is two forever distinct natures in one person, to be loved and honored alike in both natures, and therefore in her from whom he took his human nature."[9]

Mary is the Mother of God subsisting in a human nature, flesh of her flesh. Therefore, "we cannot honor Him without honoring her, if we try, nor honor her as His mother without honoring Him."[10] This maternal relationship makes the two inseparable for time and eternity. Whatever honor we render to Him as her Son—that is, to Him as come in the flesh—will overflow and extend to her.[11]

Mary is also the mother of men. In becoming man, God extrinsically ennobled humanity itself. Because of His condescension all men find themselves the brothers of the God-Man. With Him they possess humanity. It was in the womb of Mary that God fashioned for Himself a body. By a certain analogy, Mary

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.
[8] *I John*, 4: 3.
[9] Brownson, "The Worship of Mary," *op. cit.*, p. 13.
[10] *Ibid.*
[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

can be called the mother of men ennobled by this new fraternal relationship with her Son. "She is not our natural mother, in the sense of mother of our personality, but of our nature in God and in so far as we are raised to brotherhood with Christ her Son, and are made through Him one with God."[12]

Mary is also our spiritual mother. God's plan of Redemption demanded condign satisfaction for the outrage Adam had hurled at the Creator. To pay the debt in full an Infinite Being would have to suffer and die in the place of His guilty creatures. Such payment demanded a passible nature—demanded that God become man.

By the grace of union Jesus Christ was born a Victim. In His very being He was humanity's High Priest and Sacrifice.

> As Christ comes into the world, he says: "No sacrifice, no offering was thy demand; thou has endowed me instead with a body. . . . I am coming to fulfill what is written of me where the book lies unrolled; to do thy will, O my God." . . . In accordance with this divine will we have been sanctified by an offering made once for all, the body of Jesus Christ.[13]

If Jesus Christ was born a Victim, then all the people for whom He victimized Himself were spiritually born in His physical birth. Their birth to supernatural life depended upon Mary's delivery in a drafty Judean cave. Only the Word made flesh redeems, saves, and beatifies us. Only through the Incarnate Son do the saints of heaven become one with God in Beatific Vision.

> To suppose the saint here or hereafter separated from the flesh which God assumed in the womb of the Virgin would be to suppose his annihilation as a saint, as much as to suppose our separation from God as Creator would be to suppose the annihilation of our natural existence.[14]

Therefore "Mary is rightly called 'the Mother of Grace,' for she is it inasmuch as she is mother of the Sacred Flesh through which grace has been purchased and is communicated to us."[15]

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[13] *Heb.*, 5: 5, 7, 10.
[14] Brownson, "The Worship of Mary," *op. cit.*, p. 19.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

Mary co-operated in the work of Redemption not only by physically giving birth to the Incarnate Word, but also morally. In becoming God's mother she did not cease to be human. She possessed a mind and a will and her will was free. God respected that freedom.

> There was then a moment when the salvation of the world depended on the consent of Mary. Man could not be redeemed, satisfaction could not be made for sin, and grace obtained, without the Incarnation, and the Incarnation could not take place without the free, voluntary consent of this humble Jewish maiden.[16]

"Be it done unto me according to thy word." Freely she consented to the grim and glorious work of Redemption. In a passage that seems to anticipate the words of Blessed Pius X in his beautiful encyclical *Ad diem* (1904), Dr. Brownson totals the cost of that consent:

> She gave to that work all she had to give; she gave her will; she gave her flesh; she gave her own son to one long passion of thirty-three years, to the agony in the garden and the death on the cross. . . . Can we say, in view of this fact, that she has no peculiar relation to our redemption, no share in the work of our salvation?[17]

As a consequence of the part she played in the work of Redemption, Mary is the channel through which God dispenses His graces, and He dispenses none save at her intercession.[18] And this is only proper, for from her womb came the Grace of graces, the Incarnate Word.

Mary is really the mother of Our Lord, for the Word did in reality, not merely in appearance, come in the flesh. As His mother she acquired a right to His love and reverence. Voluntarily Jesus humbled Himself and, as St. Luke simply puts it, "He was subject to them."

> The Son of God in his humanity . . . was subject to Mary here and obeyed her; . . . we know no reason for supposing that [this] relation, and what pertains essentially to it, between the mother and the Son in his human nature, are not precisely . . . what they were when on earth.[19]

---

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[19] *Ibid.*

Therefore, what could He refuse this "dear mother who had borne Him in her womb, in her arms and nursed Him at her breast?" She spent herself completely to give birth to the Saviour for whom all creation yearned. "Could He confer on her a higher honor than to make her intercession the condition on which He dispenses grace to us while in the flesh?"[20] Jesus Himself has told us that there is more rejoicing in heaven over the conversion of one sinner doing penance than over ninety-nine who need not penance. But who, in heaven, after God, can more heartily rejoice that a man has saved his soul than heaven's Queen, the mother of mankind? "As she is exalted above every other creature, only God Himself can surpass her in His love for His creatures."[21]

Therefore, by her motherhood of the Incarnate Word and the unique intimacy with the High Priest and Victim of man's salvation, Mary has congruously merited the office of Mediatrix of All Grace. Though he taught this doctrine, Brownson used the term *mediatrix* with certain misgivings. It was open to misinterpretation, and if it could be misinterpreted, it would be.

As a case in point: in May, 1868, Brownson answered Rev. L. W. Bacon's indignant challenge, "Is It Honest?"[22] Attacking the whole front of Catholic practices, Bacon levelled the charge that Catholics destroy Christ by making Mary the only mediator between God and men. With his accustomed vigor, Orestes Brownson took up the challenge:

> . . . all the special honor done to her is done only in consequence of her relation as his mother . . . the higher we carry that honor the more clear, distinct, and energetic our conviction of the fact of the Incarnation, and the more impossible it must be for us to put her in the place of the Incarnate Word, to substitute her for her Son, who is the one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus. To do so would be not only to rob him of his glory, but to deny her title to that very honor given to her as the mother of God. Catholics are not capable of anything so illogical and absurd.[23]

---

[20] *Ibid.*

[21] Brownson, "Our Lady of Lourdes," *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, Last Series, III (1875), 400.

[22] L. W. Bacon, "Is It Honest?" *Brooklyn Times* (March 4, 17, 24, 1868), quoted in Brownson's *Works*, ed. by Henry F. Brownson (Detroit: Thorndike Nourse, 1884), VIII, 299 ff.

[23] *Works*, VIII, 316.

It is true that, at times, the Doctors of the Church have honored Mary with titles proclaiming her "the Second Eve," "the Reparatrix of the lost world," "the gate of heaven," and "the true mediatrix between God and men." Such marks of esteem properly belong to the woman who gave birth to the Saviour of men. But

> . . . the term mediatrix is not the best possible, because it is liable to mislead not a Catholic, but a non-Catholic, who believes little in the Incarnation, and refuses to interpret the language of Catholics by the official teaching of their Church. . . . It is the duty of non-Catholics to consult the standards of the Church and to explain what seems to them difficult or inexact in the warm and energetic expressions of Catholic love and devotion by them; and it is not honest to found a charge against Catholics on such expressions without having done so.[24]

Fundamentally, then, there is no disharmony between the writings of Dr. Brownson and the Marian doctrine of Pope Leo XIII and Blessed Pius X. For Brownson, Mary is the Second Eve, just as her Son is the Second Adam. She is the mother, as He is the father, of regenerated humanity. We are not using a mere metaphor when we call her our spiritual mother. "She is the mother of grace, through whom flows the Christian life and through whom we receive from God His gifts and graces. As the mother of our Redeemer, she is intimately connected with the work of our redemption and participates in our regeneration."[25]

To complete the full circle of his teaching, Dr. Brownson reemphasizes the claim this mother has upon her children's love and honor. If God must be honored in the works of His hands, what praise can adequately convey the dignity of His greatest triumph after the Incarnation, the Immaculate Mother of God? From her the only Mediator between God and men took flesh and dwelt among us. Her free "fiat" was the only hope of man's salvation. And now it is through her hands that all grace flows to her spiritual children. Who can surpass the honors God Himself has showered upon her? Who can gainsay them and deny her his reverence? "The Protestants," answers Brownson. They must call the honor we render to Mary idolatry or mariolatry, for

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 317.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 532.

They have lost the deep sense of the Christian religion, and really retain no worship to God superior to that which we pay to Him in His saints. In regard to external worship, it is not we who worship Mary as God, but they who do not worship God Himself as God. The peculiar distinctive external worship of God is the offering of sacrifice; but Protestants have no sacrifice, as they have no priesthood, and no altar,—even their temple is only a meetinghouse, or place of assembling together. In rejecting the Sacrifice of the Mass, they have retained nothing more than we offer to Mary and the saints.[26]

As Brownson pointed out to superstitious Boston in 1853, in rejecting the mother who, they claim, would depose the true Mediator, they have come to reject the divine Redeemer, her Son. History has proven that devotion to Mary is the hallmark of Christianity. "The worship of Mary presupposes the Incarnation, and they who shrink from it show by that fact that they do not really believe in the mystery and therefore do not really embrace the Christian religion."[27]

EDWARD DAY, C.SS.R.

Oconomowoc, Wis.

[26] "The Worship of Mary," *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, Third Series, I, 22.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

THE PRIEST AND THE OBLIGATION OF VOTING

The obligation of voting is particularly binding upon the members of the clergy to whom the laity look for guidance and example. More than any other members of the Mystical Body they should take an interest in political affairs, and especially if moral issues are involved. They have the duty of taking part in whatever advances the common good and promotes the welfare of souls. Nor is their duty limited to Election Day. They have the obligation of reminding the faithful of their duty, and in some cases, of making clear the issues at stake, especially if they be contrary to Christian morality and teaching or opposed to that liberty which the Church should enjoy.

It is true that the priest should not make his pulpit a political rostrum. But it is his duty to instruct his people in all their duties, both to the State and to the Church, as well as their responsibilities to themselves, their families and their neighbor.

—Titus Cranny, S.A., *The Moral Obligation of Voting* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1952), p. 130.

THE OBLIGATION OF PROFESSING THE FAITH

PART II

In a previous article the obligation of professing the Catholic faith was discussed from its negative aspect—that is, the prohibition to deny the true faith or to profess a false religion.[1] In this article the positive aspect of this obligation will be considered—that is, the duty of proclaiming one's acceptance of the teachings of the Catholic Church. Since it is a positive (or affirmative) precept, the theological axiom can be applied to it: "Affirmative precepts bind *semper sed non ad semper*." In other words, although we are ever subject to this law, we are not bound to exercise at all times the act which it commands. There are occasions when one may abstain from making a profession of his allegiance to the Catholic Church; indeed, at times it would be the better course to conceal the fact that one is a Catholic, as long as the method of concealing it is not equivalent to a denial. Thus, a priest in a land where the Church is being gravely persecuted, and who is striving to exercise his ministry among the faithful without being detected, would act prudently if he went about his tasks unobserved, without manifesting publicly his priestly status or even his Catholic faith.

There are, however, occasions which demand the profession of Catholic faith. The obligation in question may arise either from the divine or from the ecclesiastical law. We shall consider this obligation under this twofold heading.

A. OBLIGATION ARISING FROM DIVINE LAW

Our Divine Lord clearly stated that His followers must profess their faith in His teachings and their loyalty to Him, when He said: "Everyone who acknowledges me before men, I will also acknowledge him before my Father in heaven."[2] Christ did not explicitly state when and under what circumstances this duty is to be fulfilled. Hence, in determining this we are to be guided by the divine law and by Church legislation. The precepts of the divine law which regulate this obligation are chiefly the duty of expressing our gratitude to God for the gift of the faith, the duty

[1] *AER*, CXXVIII, 2 (Feb., 1953), 81-89. [2] *Matt.* 10: 32.

of promoting the welfare of the Church as a visible society, and the duty of assisting our neighbor in his spiritual needs by fostering in him an appreciation and love for the true faith and by protecting his faith from harm.

St. Thomas propounds the obligation of professing the faith from divine law in these words:

> Affirmative precepts do not oblige for all times *(ad semper)* though they bind at all times *(semper)*. They bind, however, in accordance with the time and the place, as determined by other circumstances by which a human act is constituted an act of virtue. Thus, to profess the faith is not always or in every place necessary for salvation, but it is necessary in some places and times—namely, when by the omission of such profession the honor due to God would be taken away, and when the service due to our neighbor would be omitted.[3]

The Code of Canon Law expresses the divinely imposed obligation of professing the Catholic faith in these words: "The faithful are bound to profess the faith of Christ openly as often as their silence, backwardness[4] or manner of acting would involve an implicit denial of the faith, contempt of religion, an insult to God or scandal to neighbor."[5] The Canon does not expressly state that it is propounding a divine law; but the particular occasions which it mentions as calling for an open profession of faith are such as are evidently imposed by the natural law itself.

Those who are bound to profess the faith by divine law fall naturally into two categories—converts, those adults who are not yet members of the Catholic Church but are aware of the truth of the Catholic faith and intend to enter the Church, and those who are already members of the Church.

1. *Obligation of Converts to Profess the Faith*

A very important distinction must be made between the obligation to elicit an act of faith and the obligation to profess the

[3] *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 3, a. 2.

[4] The word used in the Code is *tergiversatio*, which is literally "a turning of the back." It is translated "subterfuge" in Woywood-Smith's *A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law* (n. 1346). A more exact translation, it seems, is "backwardness," which is found in Abbo-Hannan's *The Sacred Canons* (n. 1325). This is also given first of several terms in Cassell's *Latin Dictionary*.

[5] Canon 1325, §1.

faith. An act of faith is by its nature an internal act; the profession of faith is necessarily an external act, perceptible by at least one other person besides the one making the profession. Theologians teach commonly that as soon as a person has come to the conviction that the teaching of the Catholic Church has been revealed by God and must be believed by all men he is bound at once to make an act of faith. In the words of Father Davis:

> The act of faith must be elicited when a person first comes to the knowledge of Divine Revelation, for then he is conscious that God is appealing to his intellect, and he must bring it under the yoke of faith. . . . [It must be elicited] when infidels or heretics have the faith so proposed to them that they recognize the obligation of believing. It would be a grievous sin against faith if such persons deferred making the act of faith.[6]

However, there is not a similar obligation of *professing* the faith externally as soon as one is convinced that the teachings of the Catholic Church are the message of divine revelation. As Prümmer asserts: "If at times a *public* conversion is most difficult, for example, on account of the civil laws [in Russia] or on account of most grave difficulties which would result therefrom, it is permitted to defer it for a time according to the prudent judgment of a pastor or a confessor."[7]

In our country hardship arising from civil laws is not present to justify a person in deferring a public profession of the Catholic faith as soon as he has realized the truth of Catholicism. But there are occasions when great difficulties and inconveniences would ensue from the acknowledgment by one who had been a non-Catholic that he is now convinced that the Catholic religion is true and that he intends to enter the Catholic Church. The most frequent example of such circumstances is that of a young person—a child of twelve or thirteen years—who has become convinced that the Catholic religion is true, but who would encounter great opposition from the other members of the family (especially the father and mother) if he openly announced his belief and his intention of entering the Catholic Church. In addition, there could be serious legal difficulties if a priest formally admitted such a child against the will of its parents.

[6] *Moral and Pastoral Theology* (London, 1945), I, 278.
[7] *Manuale theologiae moralis* (Friburg, 1935), I, n. 509.

In such a case a deferment of entrance into the Church and of the public profession of faith is perfectly lawful, and usually the more prudent course. Father Rebesher, S.S.J., thus expresses his opinion on the matter:

> Even against parental objection a minor has a right to receive baptism when he understands what baptism is and his conscience tells him that he should receive it. This is not merely a right granted by ecclesiastical law; it is a right granted by divine law, for in affairs that concern one's salvation, one has individual rights and duties, in the exercise of which no one may interfere. Practically, however, if the parents object to a minor child receiving baptism, it is better that the child be put off until such time as there is some assurance that he will have an opportunity to practice the Faith. Besides, it is not certain that the delay of baptism, even for a long time, is a serious matter, since St. Thomas and other theologians hold that it is not *per se* a mortal sin to delay baptism until danger of death, unless the reason on account of which it is deferred is gravely sinful.[8]

It should be remarked that this last sentence does not seem to represent the true mind of St. Thomas. What he meant is that the divine precept of Baptism does not *in itself* contain any further obligation than to receive this sacrament before death. But from other divine precepts, especially the obligation of well-regulated charity toward oneself, it follows that a person is obliged by divine law to receive Baptism without too great delay after coming to the knowledge of the faith.[9] A sufficiently grave reason, however, will permit the deferring of this sacrament and the formal entrance into the Church even for several years; and such a reason can be present in the case of young children. The judgment of Genicot-Salsmans on such a case is: "Pastors of souls are not to be blamed who refuse to admit such boys or girls at once to Baptism, against the will of their parents, but command them to wait until even civilly they are fully emancipated, or have given convincing proof of their perseverance by a sufficiently long probation."[10]

In the *Casus conscientiae* of Genicot-Salsmans this doctrine is applied to young girls attending a Catholic boarding school, and even to a married woman whose husband is much opposed to her

[8] *Convert-Making* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1938), p. 75.
[9] Cf. Doronzo, *De baptismo et confirmatione* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1945), p. 126.
[10] *Institutiones theologiae moralis* (Brussels, 1927), II, n. 151.

entrance into the Church. In such cases, according to the authors, the public profession of faith and reception into the Church had best be deferred for some time; though in the meantime the individuals should be urged to acquire the state of grace by an act of divine charity and to keep up their study of Catholic truth.[11]

The case of an adult who would have to suffer great hardships in the event that he professed Catholicism immediately after coming to the knowledge and conviction of the faith would offer another problem. For example, if a candidate for the office of President of the United States received the grace of faith in the course of the campaign, would he be bound to make it public that he is planning soon to enter the Catholic Church? Certainly, in view of the opposition to the Catholic Church that is so widespread in our land, every chance of election would be sacrificed as soon as such an announcement were made to the voters of the United States. He would have no obligation to acknowledge his conversion in such circumstances, because that fact would not furnish a single American voter with a *reasonable* cause for changing his preference, either for or against the candidate. However, it would be a noble and holy deed for a man in such a situation to profess before his American fellow citizens his intentions of entering the Catholic Church and to endure the sacrifice of his earthly ambitions which would inevitably follow.

In any event, it would not be permitted for a person to abstain from professing the Catholic faith for an indefinite period of time —particularly, for the rest of his days, unless he forsees that death is near. More than three centuries ago the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda gave a decision that a Mohammedan who wished to become a Catholic, and yet to conceal his faith indefinitely because his life would be endangered if it were known he had entered the Church, would not be permitted to adopt this procedure, but should move elsewhere in order that he might profess his religion openly.[12] Stories are sometimes circulated about the secret conversion of distinguished persons. At the turn of the century there was a rumor that Queen Victoria of England was actually a Catholic during the last years of her life but concealed the fact because of the storm of opposition that would be aroused if it became known. But, although all the loyal Catholic sub-

[11] Cf. *Casus conscientiae* (Brussels, 1947), pp. 439-41.
[12] *Collectanea S.C. Prop. Fid.*, I, n. 84.

jects of the venerable monarch would have been very happy to learn of her conversion to the true faith, it is very unlikely that such a thing did occur, in view of the fact that she would have been obliged in conscience to profess her affiliation with the Catholic Church, even though in consequence her place on the throne of England was endangered.

The matter is somewhat different in the case of a deathbed conversion. When a person turns to the true Church in the final hours of life, there may be circumstances that will justify the concealment of the fact. There may be such a storm of bitterness and hatred aroused by the members of the family that a priest will be permitted to receive the dying person into the Church and give him the sacraments without divulging the incident. However, in such a case the priest should have the sick person express his acceptance of the Catholic faith before two witnesses, if this is at all possible, and the conversion should be recorded in the parish files.[13] Furthermore, if the dying person were an individual of considerable influence, and especially if he had engaged in propagating false worship or had been known for his hostility to the Catholic Church, his conversion should ordinarily be made known openly—at least after his death—in order that some reparation may be made for the harm he has done. Lehmkuhl considers the case of a non-Catholic minister who turns to the Church in his last hours, and admits that it is difficult to decide in such a case whether the conversion should be made public or not, because it is hardly possible to predict which course would produce more good and less evil. At any rate, he says, the fact should be sufficiently attested by witnesses so that if necessary it can be divulged later.[14]

However, it must be emphasized that even when a person who has come to the conviction of the Catholic faith is justified in deferring a public profession and reception into the Church, he may not in the meantime take any active part in non-Catholic public worship. At most, he would be permitted to assist passively at non-Catholic rites occasionally.

2. *Obligation of Members of the Church to Profess the Faith*

It would be impossible to point out all the particular occasions

[13] Cf. Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis* (Paris, 1938), I, n. 715.

[14] Cf. *Casus conscientiae* (Friburg, 1907), I, 95-97.

on which Catholics are bound by divine law to profess their belief in the teachings of the Church—either the teachings in general or some particular doctrine. Some Catholics find themselves in situations that call for this duty much more frequently than others. Thus, a Catholic married to a non-Catholic might often be obligated to assert his loyalty to the faith; a student in a secular college might find himself in a similar situation, both in the classroom and in his associations with the other students. The four instances demanding a profession of faith by divine law according to the Code—when silence, backwardness or manner of acting would involve an implicit denial of the faith, contempt of religion, an insult to God or scandal of one's neighbor—are sufficiently wide to cover many possible cases. We shall consider only a few, which would be most likely to occur.

A person is questioned as to his religious belief by a governmental official. As far as the United States is concerned, he would not be bound to profess himself a Catholic. It is true, Pope Innocent XI condemned a proposition asserting that a Catholic could remain silent when questioned by a public official as to his faith;[15] however, as Kenrick remarks, "in our country, where the laws have no concern for the faith or religion of the citizens, a person can often stand on his rights and reject the interrogation as out of order."[16] An example of such a case might be the questioning by a census-taker. It would seem that a Catholic would not do any wrong, as far as the faith is concerned, if he refused to state what religion he professes. Needless to say, such a procedure would ordinarily be unreasonable, since there can hardly be any just cause for this manner of acting. Furthermore, it would never be permitted in such a case to deny one's Catholic faith or profess some non-Catholic religious belief.

A Catholic is a member of a group, one of whom says something derogatory or erroneous about the Church or Catholic belief, without realizing that there is a Catholic present. Ordinarily, the Catholic should courteously but firmly acknowledge himself as such, and take exception to the statement. If he is sufficiently familiar with the Church's teachings to refute the charge and to explain the point at issue, and if he feel that the listeners will give him a fair hearing, he should undertake this task; otherwise, it will suffice if he merely declares himself a Catholic and lets it

[15] *DB*, 1168.

[16] *Theologia moralis* (Philadelphia, 1842), II, 277.

be known that remarks against the Church and the faith are offensive to him.

A Catholic hears remarks against the faith in a public place, such as a train or restaurant, from persons unknown to him. In such circumstances there seems to be no obligation for the lay person to make any declaration or defense. A priest might be expected to speak in a situation of this kind, though even he sometimes might find it more effective to treat such insults with calm contempt.

A Catholic seeking a job is asked his religious affiliation. He knows that if he declares himself a member of the Catholic Church he will be rejected. Has he an obligation of professing his faith? I believe a distinction is in order. If the position is in governmental service, such as the post of clerk in a federal department or school teacher, there is no obligation to state one's religion, because that is not a factor to be considered in American political life. But if the employment is on the domestic level (such as the job of nursemaid) or in private business (such as the job of clerk in a store) I am of the opinion that the Catholic applicant has the obligation to acknowledge his faith openly if inquiry is made. For, as far as commutative justice is concerned, a person has the right to employ only those of a particular religious creed.

B. OBLIGATION ARISING FROM ECCLESIASTICAL LAW

The law of the Church obliges certain persons to make a profession of faith according to a definite and prescribed formula on certain occasions. Thus, those converted to the Church from heresy are to pronounce a profession of faith according to a form prescribed in 1942.[17] Children not yet fourteen years of age make a sufficient profession of faith by the recitation of the Apostles' Creed.[18] It should be noted that these rules concern the reception into the Church of persons who have certainly or probably been baptized; for the formula of faith required of those who

[17] The formula is found in Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, II (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1943), 182-84. It is the same that is found in the Preface to the Code, with a few sentences added, expressing the abjuration of heresy. Substantially it is the profession of faith prescribed by Pope Pius IV in 1564 (*DB*, 994-1000), with some additions made after the Vatican Council.

[18] Cf. Goodwine, *The Reception of Converts* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1944), p. 101.

have never been baptized is that which is contained in the baptismal ceremony itself.

Canon 1406 enumerates various persons who are bound to make a profession of faith according to the formula approved by the Apostolic See—namely, those who attend a Council or Synod and have a consultive or deliberative vote, those who preside over such gatherings, those promoted to the dignity of Cardinal, Bishop, Abbot, Prelate *nullius*, Vicar or Prefect Apostolic, Vicars Capitular, Canons, diocesan consultors, Vicars General, pastors and those receiving benefices with the care of souls, rectors of seminaries, professors of theology, canon law and philosophy, candidates for the subdiaconate, censors of books, confessors and preachers, the rector and the professors of a university or a canonically erected Faculty, those receiving academic degrees, and superiors in clerical religious orders. These individuals are bound by this Canon to make a profession of faith in the presence of a deputed person before they assume their various offices. Teachers of the sacred sciences and professors in universities are bound to make the profession "at the beginning of each scholastic year, or at least at the beginning of their office."

On Sept. 1, 1910, Pope Pius X issued the Motu Proprio *Sacrorum antistitum* which required a profession of faith from certain other persons—Lenten preachers, all promoted to benefices, officials of Roman Congregations and tribunals, and all officials of ecclesiastical curias and tribunals. He also imposed on many classes of those who are bound to make the profession of faith the additional obligation of pronouncing an oath against the errors of Modernism.[19] By virtue of Canon 6, §6, the prescriptions of this Motu Proprio would have ceased with the promulgation of the Code. However, a decision of the Holy Office issued on March 22, 1918, commanded that these rules be continued in force until the Holy See expressly abrogates them.[20] There are some practical points that should be noted in this connection. Thus, the Code requires that professors of seminaries and religious communities make the profession of faith only at the beginning of their office; but this Motu Proprio requires an annual renewal of the profession and the oath against Modernism.

The Lenten preachers mentioned in this Motu Proprio are

[19] *Fontes juris canonici* (Rome, 1925), III, 774-90.

[20] *AAS*, X (1918), 136. The same ruling is applied to the maintenance of Vigilance Committees in dioceses.

probably only those who preach every day in Lent—not those who speak only once a week in Lent or give an occasional sermon during that season.[21]

It is evident that non-Catholic professors in a Catholic university are not bound to make a profession of Catholic faith, since the Church does not coerce anyone to accept her doctrines against his conscience. As Father Canavan states: "An indication of the Church's mind on the matter is to be found in the Statutes of the Catholic University of America, where it is specifically stated that non-Catholic professors are not bound to make a profession of faith. These statutes were approved by the Holy See. In the absence of such a ruling from the Holy See, however, it would seem that a canonically erected Pontifical university would sin, at least against the spirit of the law on profession of faith, by employing a non-Catholic professor, at least in any of the four classical branches."[22] The four classical branches are theology, philosophy, canon law, and scripture. Of course, the authorities of any Catholic institution that employs non-Catholic instructors are bound to see that nothing is proposed by these persons which is opposed to the teaching of the Church.

* * * * *

It is well for priests to impress their people from time to time with their duty to profess the faith when the occasion demands it, and especially with the gravity of the sin of ever denying their faith, either implicitly or explicitly. Our Catholics should be urged to make a profession of faith proudly and gratefully, even when there is no strict obligation to do so, as when they put Catholic pictures and the crucifix in a prominent place in their homes and when they show a sign of reverence in passing the church. They should be told that it is the greatest privilege they could possess in life to have the true faith. And they should be encouraged to look forward to a great reward for their open profession of the faith from Him who promised to acknowledge them in turn before His Father in heaven.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C.

[21] Canavan, *Profession of Faith* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1942), p. 113. This author enumerates those who are bound to the anti-Modernistic oath as well as to the profession of faith.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 96.

AN EVALUATION OF THE KONNERSREUTH CONTROVERSY

Part II

In the first part of this article it was shown that stigmata may arise out of an ecstatic emotion. In some cases such an emotional state may be induced by natural means and the stigmata resulting would be purely natural. But if a psychiatrist, hypnotist, or the ecstatics themselves can set in motion the psychosomatic mechanism that eventually produces stigmatization, it is obvious that God can equally do as much. Indeed in some cases He has done just that. We then speak of supernatural or divine stigmata. The question is, how this kind of stigmatization can be proved and whether it occurs in the Konnersreuth case. In other words, what are the criteria for deciding, diabolic influences being excluded as improbable, whether or not the ecstasies and stigmata of Therese Neumann have a divine cause?

Miss Graef enumerates three criteria: evident sanctity, mass conversions and miracles. With regard to the first criterion, it suffices to repeat what we have discussed previously at length, namely that personal sanctity is no proof of the supernatural character of stigmata and that the lack of sanctity is no criterion to deny their supernatural origin.

Father Siwek concentrates his discussion of the criteria in the visions that occasion the ecstatic emotional states. His line of argument is: if visions are divinely inspired, the ecstatic emotion is supernatural and the resulting stigmata are also supernatural. As to the question, how visions can be proven to be supernatural, the author omits reference to personal sanctity as not relevant, but mentions, as Graef does, spiritual fruits like conversion and the authenticity of miracles, including revelations.

For a methodical answer to the problem of the criteria in the Konnersreuth case, it may perhaps serve clarity, if we enumerate the main events that are said to happen in it. They are: visions, ecstasies, stigmatic flow of blood, cures from illness, clairvoyance, hierognosis (identification of sacred objects), revelations, hearing and speaking a foreign tongue, particularly Aramaic, inedia (fasting). The first three phenomena constitute a chain, both logical and methodological, the nature of which is precisely

the subject of discussion. The remaining events may be called concomitant or accessory phenomena which, if they cannot be explained naturally, would fall in the category of the miraculous.

It might be possible that visions in themselves bear the indications of their divine origin, such as the mystical life of the visionary, some special characteristics accompanying the visionary state or its effects. The reports about the mystical life of Therese Neumann are so conflicting that it seems almost impossible to arrive at any clear-cut conclusion. The difficulty is probably due to the very nature of mystical experiences, since they are as such of the subjective order.

Turning to other objectively observable facts, it cannot be denied that some of the proofs presented by the so-called Konnersreuth circle are rather shaky, as for instance, the evidence based on the immediacy with which the 25 to 30 ecstatic Friday visions occur. Their suddenness is certainly a striking feature. The present writer, while watching the Friday scenes, confesses that he was little impressed by any of the other phenomena, but that he was rather struck by the suddenness with which the visionary was caught in rapture, cutting off any conversation that had been taking place in the periods between visions. Nonetheless, it would be stressing the point, if we were to see in this feature evidence of the supernatural character of the visions.

Another criterion for the supernatural character of the visions would be sought in the effects: the visions are spiritually fruitful, inasmuch as they increase the love of God and repentance for sins in the hearts of spectators and people who read or hear about Konnersreuth. The Konnersreuth visions undeniably have spiritual fruits of this kind, as is evidenced, among other things, in the conversion of several persons to the Catholic faith.[1] This criterion, therefore, should not lightly be put aside. Siwek tries to dismiss it, but in our opinion in a logically untenable way. He admits that this criterion would prove that the visions derive indeed from God and not from the devil, but he argues that it fails to note the manner in which they derive from God.[2] Here

[1] Odo Staudinger, *Der Heiland is gut. Auffallende Heilungen und Bekehrungen durch Konnersreuth* (Salzburg: Pustet, 1935).

[2] P. Siwek, S.J., *Une stigmatisée de nos jours. Etude de psychologie religieuse* (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1950), p. 141.

we meet an illustration of how the author seems to retrace his steps in the course of his argumentation. Actually we are no longer concerned with the *modus quo*, but with the cause. If—as the author admits—the visions of Therese Neumann derive from God, they are supernatural *quoad causam*, and that is what we are called upon to prove at this juncture. No longer are we interested in the psychophysical mechanism that God may or may not use to produce the effects He desires.

Miss Graef, when dealing with the topic of spiritual fruits as a criterion, feels that they should show themselves in the form of mass conversions. Why conversions should be *en masse*, in order to yield a valid proof, I cannot imagine. If Konnersreuth has occasioned—as indeed it has—numerous and striking conversions, even among atheists, and has revived the religious life of a great many people, this fact would rather speak in favor of the supernatural character of the Konnersreuth events. According to Benedict XIV, spiritual fruits are precisely among the reasons why God might accord stigmatization even to sinners and pagans.

All Catholic authors agree that the incontrovertible proof for the divine origin of visions and the resulting stigmata would lie in the existence of miracles. However, we have to add a restriction. We must also be sure that God works the miracles, if such there be, precisely in order to confirm the supernatural character of *charismata*, as visions and stigmata. Again, this is in accordance with the mind of the Church. For it is generally admitted that the canonization of a stigmatic does not imply any decision about the supernatural origin of his or her charismata. It would then follow that the official recognition of the miracles required for the canonization is not considered to be a criterion of the individual's charismata.[3] Consequently, miraculous events in the

[3] An interesting problem may be raised by considering the following facts concerning the charismata of St. Gemma Galgani. The decree attesting the heroicity of Gemma's virtues (not the apostolic letter of beatification, as Hilda Graef erroneously observes in *The Tablet*, CXCVII, 5794 [1951], 462) explicitly states that it did not in any way involve a decision with regard to the preternatural *charismata* of the Servant of God. "Hanc vero diem, Dominicam primam Adventus. . . . [Sanctissimus Pater] feliciter elegit ut super heroicis virtutibus hujus innocentis aeque ac poenitentis puellae suam mentem panderet, nullo tamen per praesens decretum (quod quidem numquam fieri solet) prolato judicio de praeternaturalibus Servae Dei charismatibus" (*AAS*, XXIV

life of Therese Neumann, *if there are any*, would not automatically and with conclusive certainty prove the divine origin of her stigmata. But before this final question can be settled, we must first be sure that there are actually miraculous events in the life of Therese. Are there any such events?

In seeking them out, many authors turn to investigating the phenomena which we have designated as concomitant, the bleeding of the stigmata, revelations, cures, the speaking of Aramaic and similar phenomena, fasting.

Upon visiting Konnersreuth, the general public is usually more impressed by the bleeding of the stigmata than by anything else, and sees in it something really miraculous. Is there, in truth, spontaneous bleeding and is it miraculous? Some authors, basing their opinion on the report of the Episcopal Commission previously mentioned, express doubt as to a spontaneous flow of blood. The report was drawn up by Dr. Martini, director of the medical clinic of the University of Bonn and member of the Episcopal Commission which observed Therese Neumann in her home throughout one of her passions, on Thursday, March 22, and Friday, March 23, 1928. The other members of the Commission were Msgr. Michael Buchberger, Bishop of Regensburg, the Auxiliary Bishop Msgr. Kierl, Father Naber the pastor, and a group of university professors. Hilda Graef cites this report at length but it may be said in passing that the report came to her in a somewhat roundabout way. It is said to be based on stenographic notes taken on the spot, though it was actually published ten years later by J. Deutsch.[4] Dr. de Poray-Madeyski translated this same report into French[5] and Miss Graef rendered an

---

[1932], 57). This declaration has been given wide publicity. However, in contrast to it, one may point at the words of the Pope spoken at the canonization itself, that is to say after a number of miracles had been officially recognized. Pope Pius XII declared in the homily which he held during the Holy Mass immediately following the canonization of St. Gemma that the altogether astonishing charismata derived from God: "At 'qui ponit humiles in sublime' dona ac charismata, miranda prorsus, Lucensi virgini dilargitur est" (*AAS*, XXXII [1940], 173).

[4] J. Deutsch, *Ärztliche Kritik an Konnersreuth. Wunder oder Hysteria?* (Lippstadt: Selbstverlag, 1938).

[5] B. de Poray-Madeyski, *Le cas de la visionnaire stigmatisée Thérèse Neumann de Konnersreuth* (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1940), pp. 117-29.

English version of the French translation.[6] Hence, this report in the form of publication derives from Deutsch.

According to the Deutsch report, Dr. Martini says that he failed to observe any spontaneous flow of blood, but that he noticed an increase in the quantity of blood each time the observers re-entered the room of Therese after being requested by the family to withdraw for a few minutes because the girl had to relieve herself. In a statement adjoined to the report, Martini —or the one responsible for the addition—expresses his suspicion that certain manipulations during the absence of the Commission were made to increase the quantity of blood. Analyzing this inference Professor Waldmann, quoted by Graef with apparent approval, simply suggests that mother Neumann "helped" with the bleeding. He likewise maintains that the additional blood was menstruation blood.

The manipulation theory however is discarded by most authors, because it goes counter to the observation of innumerable eye witnesses, among whom also is the present writer. All have noticed a spontaneous flow of blood from the eyes of Therese Neumann, and physicians together with other observers, even employing magnifying glasses, discerned blood flowing also from the stigmata when active. Opinions differ as to the origin of this blood, some hold that the blood is ordinary blood and point out that people suffering from vegetative neurosis are able to control the so-called autonomous nervous system to the extent that they may enervate at will the blood vessels and glands, so as to produce bleeding at any points of the skin. Therese Neumann is relegated to this category and, as a religious type, would preferably cause the bleeding to appear in those spots of the skin where Christ received the wounds. It is a theory that puts Therese Neumann in the class of the "fakirs" who by the same mechanism of inborn vegetative neurosis or training (Yoga) are able to produce the inverse phenomena of inhibiting bleeding, even though their body is pierced with a dagger.

Others believe that the blood that flows during passions of Therese Neumann is menstruation blood, but in a very different sense from the above mentioned manipulation theory. What is

[6] H. Graef, *The Case of Therese Neumann* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1951), pp. 54-65.

meant here is vicarious menstruation, in which the blood women normally lose during the menstruation period is caused to flow from other parts of the body. The possibility of vicarious menstruation cannot be denied, and Siwek[7] advances it by way of explanation in the case of Therese Neumann though hesitatingly. He points out among the reasons for this hypothesis that only two of the hundreds of known stigmatics were men, and in women alone stigmata bleed copiously (this reason is hardly correct, as is evidenced in the case of P. Pio di Pietrelcina), and that normal menstruations of Therese Neumann have ceased since 1920 or 1921.

In order to confirm the hypothesis of vicarious menstruation, some authors have made much of the cessation of bleeding on March 24, 1951, a date that marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of the well-known Konnersreuth phenomena. Since Therese was almost fifty-three years old—she was born April 9, 1898—these authors simply explained the fact by pointing out that Therese had reached the menopause. Her aged pastor Naber, of the mind that the interruption of the bleeding phenomena was merely temporary and to be accepted as a kind of celebration of the silver jubilee of the girl's experiences, was perhaps nearer to the truth, because the flow of blood, the ecstasies and accompanying phenomena reappeared shortly. This fact undoubtedly is a blow to the menstruation theory, but whatever explanation for the bleeding is to be offered, the solution of the problem is of secondary importance, because a spontaneous flow of blood happens also with stigmata naturally induced.

Are there in the Konnersreuth case any authenticated revelations and do they come from God? The answer seems to be negative, because the so-called revelations which some authors would ascribe to Therese are fairly insignificant or not too well authenticated. On the contrary, some "revelations" which Therese Neumann is purported to have made, if true, would forcefully weaken her position. Such are especially statements credited to Therese that César Vachère, an excommunicated priest and a certain spinster, Sister Canisia by name, are in heaven though both died impenitent. Hilda Graef puts great

[7] *Op. cit.*, pp. 91-93. See also A. Niedermeyer, *Handbuch der speziellen Pastoral Medizin* (Wien: Herder, 1952), V, 419.

emphasis on the latter case, and we can well imagine that the devil's advocate would do likewise should the cause of Therese Neumann ever come up for beatification. True, some authors try to explain it away by pointing out that Sister Canisia was not responsible for her blasphemous conduct inasmuch as she was declared insane. Even so, these self-styled revelations form one of the weakest chapters in the history of Therese Neumann and so much so that the late Bishop Schrembs of Cleveland was forced to abandon his original enthusiastic reaction on behalf of Konnersreuth, upon discovering that Therese's "revelations" were simply false.

Advocates of Konnersreuth, particularly the journalist Gerlich, as well as Archbishop Teodorowicz, endeavor to demonstrate the cures of the ailments which Therese suffered as of a miraculous nature. However, these so-called cures are expressly controversial and allowing them as valid tends to work like a boomerang. As was noted, the majority of physicians, e.g., Deutsch, Heermann, Ewald, Masoin, Lhermitte, etc., far from seeing anything miraculous in these cures, consider the long series of ailments in Therese and their subsequent cures as purely psychogenic. They maintain that in these cures is proof that Therese Neumann precisely at the time was hysterical, at least in the sense of phenomenological hysteria.

A large number of writers attribute something miraculous to the alleged knowledge Therese seems to have concerning the internal state of soul of individuals, the power of clairvoyance and of identification of sacred objects, that of answering unformulated questions and her alleged knowledge of foreign languages, particularly of Aramaic. Since the latter phenomenon is the more widely discussed, let us single this out for attention.

The argument of the advocates of Konnersreuth is that this phenomenon cannot be explained naturally and since there is no evidence of preternatural influence, the cause must be therefore supernatural. The line of attack against this argument is threefold: (1) it is claimed that the facts are not established with certainty; (2) even if they are well established, a natural explanation is possible; (3) should the natural explanation fail, it is still possible to ascribe the phenomena to diabolical intervention. The third opinion has had few supporters and their evidence for

the most part consisted of inferences and insinuations. For that reason diabolic intervention can safely be discarded. We therefore concentrate upon the other two objections.

Is it a fact that Therese Neumann speaks Aramaic in the states of "childlike infatuation" which follow her visions? As has been suggested,[8] some of the words supposed to be Aramaic sound suspiciously like Bavarian patois; yet experts in Semitic languages, as Wutz, Bauer, Leiber leave no doubt that Therese indeed repeats Aramaic phrases.[9]

If this is true, the next question, of course, is that of explaining the fact. Does the girl repeat what she hears in her visionary states, or are those phrases transmitted to her in another way? Several proponents of the hysteria-hypothesis feel that hysteria alone fails to account for such phenomena and therefore resort to the additional factor of mental telepathy, noting that persons with a telepathic disposition are often hysterical. Miss Graef, on the suggestion of Dr. Michael Waldmann, has adopted this theory in the Konnersreuth case. Attaching great importance to the workings of the subconscious mind, it is assumed that a subconscious, telepathic relationship between Therese and other persons may provide an answer to the problem. Therese Neumann is thus supposed to utter Aramaic words and phrases which are mentally transmitted to her by bystanders who know the language, and especially Dr. Wutz, professor of Semitic languages, is proposed as the possible vehicle of the telepathic transmission.

A common sense question, to be answered before the problem concerning the possibility of telepathy can be raised, is the following: did Therese Neumann begin to speak Aramaic or to intimate hearing a strange language in her visions after she met Wutz or whoever is supposed to be responsible for telepathic transmission, or was Wutz called in after Therese began to speak or intimate the hearing of a foreign tongue? It has been remarked (de Poray-Madeyski) that the woman gradually developed her "aptitude to retain and repeat according to their sounds words and phrases in foreign languages heard in the course of her visions."

[8] H. Graef, *op. cit.*, p. 90; P. Siwek, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

[9] Joannes Bauer, *Zeitschrift fur Parapsychologie* (July, 1928); Robert Leiber, S.J., "Konnersreuth," *Stimmen der Zeit*, CIV (1927), 161.

This may be so, but we are interested in the first appearance of this "aptitude." It has also been ventured (Ewald) that the development of this "aptitude" was due to Wutz who has "drummed a good deal into her." If this is true, the telepathy-theory seems quite superfluous, because "drumming into" looks very much like suggestion or rather drill. Yet Graef and others do not seem to be satisfied with the drill-theory, since they advance the telepathy-hypothesis.

There are actually parallel examples of what seem to be cases of telepathic transference of languages. One such case—as described by Von Neureiter[10]—concerns a Lettish mentally deficient girl who could not read and could speak only Lettish. Yet when she was given a book and a person at her side read the text mentally, she too was able to read without any error, even though the text was printed in a foreign language.

Ascribing such and similar cases to telepathy, we do little else than employ a descriptive term, because telepathy is a mystifying phenomenon which itself needs explanation. The reference[11] of Miss Graef to the work of J. B. Rhine at Duke University on transfer of thought and other so-called parapsychological phenomena, as clairvoyance, prognosis, psychokinesis, seems to convey the impression that she believes that telepathic relationship is to be explained on the basis of extrasensory perception which in final analysis comes down to the mind controlling matter. However, the experiments of Rhine have come under sharp criticism, mathematically, psychologically and philosophically. It seems even highly doubtful that his experiments yield a better than chance result, as was evidenced by one of the present writer's students who tested Rhine's claims experimentally. Another psychologist, Richard S. Kaufman of Yale University, reported at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association held at Atlantic City (March, 1952) that he had tested one of the claims made by Rhine, adding however a reliable observer, namely a well-concealed camera, and he came to the conclusion that the camera results gave no evidence of extrasensory perception. Therefore, any reference to the controversial theories of Rhine,

[10] Ferdinand von Neureiter, *Wissen um fremdes Wissen, auf unbekanntem Wege erworben; Experimentelle Untersuchung* (Gotha: Klotz, 1935).

[11] *Op. cit.*, p. 120.

in order to explain telepathic relationship, is somewhat premature.

Actually, it would seem to be an established fact that transfer of thought occurs. In most cases there is no reason to explain this fact by supernatural or preternatural influences, though we must admit that little progress has been made in securing a satisfactory natural explanation. In the case of Therese Neumann speaking Aramaic, the development or perfection of her Aramaic vocabulary could perhaps be attributed to some telepathic influence, and especially to that of simple suggestions—without any telepathy—on the part of Semitic language scholars who were called in after Therese Neumann had begun to stammer or to intimate some strange-sounding words. But before these experts appeared on the scene, where did Therese Neumann pick up these words? Through reading, or unaccountable telepathic influences coming from equally unaccountable distant sources, or were these phrases communicated in her visions? The question is still open to discussion.

With reference to telepathy, the role of the parish priest, Father Naber, is accentuated by several authors and among them Miss Graef who reports disappointing experiences in the rectory. She devotes an entire chapter to the priest—many more pages than she allows for the crucial problem with regard to inedia. It is a chapter conveying the impression that the old pastor is a simple, well-meaning, but dangerous man who, for all his naivete, is "the driving power behind Therese Neumann." Naber is supposed to possess remarkably strong suggestive and telepathic powers which make Therese Neumann see visions quite in the way he wants her to see. The pastor is even accredited with playing some obscure unidentified role in regard to her fasting. No one dares openly to declare the pastor an accomplice in the alleged deception, but innuendoes are not lacking. All this has been pointed out previously and may be partially true or half-true. A common sense question arises which no one has answered satisfactorily so far, namely, if the parish priest exerts such a sinister influence in the Konnersreuth case, why has the Bishop of Regensburg never removed an influence so ostensibly dangerous? When Miss Graef, in order to establish the telepathic relationship between Father Naber and Therese Neumann as credible, asserts that "the intimacy of the spiritual

relationship between confessor and penitent would be an extremely favorable background for the development of such phenomena," i.e. a telepathic communication, we would like to know the number of confessors who have experienced any such telepathic relationships. Are we being asked to countenance an element of telepathy in the sacramental relationship between confessor and penitent? On the one hand confessors might perhaps welcome the opportunity to communicate repentance to their penitents, but on the other hand, the free will would indeed be jeopardized.

It has also been advanced that Father Naber is a shrewd business man, because he once expressed the wish to capitalize on the Konnersreuth case by giving some lectures on it in the United States. Whether this is true or not is immaterial as far as Therese Neumann is concerned.

If miracles are a proof of the supernatural nature of the Konnersreuth phenomena, the decisive criterion is probably to be sought in the alleged fasting of Therese Neumann. She is reported as not having partaken of any food, except particles of the Host, since the year 1926, and has been without liquid of any kind since the year 1927. Despite the importance that this mysterious phenomenon, if true, would have for the solution of the Konnersreuth case, it is surprising to note that Miss Graef fails to set aside a special chapter for it and only discusses it under the heading of publicity and investigation.[12]

An exposition of the problem of fasting requires furnishing an answer to two questions: (1) Is there genuine and absolute inedia? (2) If so, can a possible natural explanation be given it? This seems to be the logical sequence of the questions, because as long as the factual problem remains indetermined, the question of the character thereof continues to be a rather academic one. On the other hand, it would make little difference whether Therese Neumann does or does not eat, if her fasting is to be considered something basically natural. That is why we prefer to concentrate upon the second question in the first place.

Let us presume a real, or if such thing has not actually been

[12] The reader will find an excellent discussion of Therese Neumann's fasting in Thomas Pater, "Prolonged Fasting and Therese Neumann," *AER*, CXXV (1951), 417-30.

evidenced, an imaginary case of permanent genuine inedia, wherein every trace of fraud is excluded. Would a natural explanation be available? One theory is that of self-consumption, which would see in the process a form of slow starvation. Of course, self-consumption cannot extend over too great length of time. Much less one enduring for twenty-six years as in the case with Therese Neumann. A typical example illustrating the starvation theory is that given by Maurice Chideckel.[13] The validity of the theory may be weighed in the light of the following. At the time the author wrote his article (1939) a news dispatch was in circulation announcing Therese Neumann to have died. Apparently accepting her fasting as a fact, Chideckel was of the mind that she died of slow starvation. To date, thirteen years later, the starvation process has not yet achieved its objective.

Cardinal Prosper Lambertini, who later became Pope Benedict XIV, in the classical treatise *De servorum Dei beatificatione et de beatorum canonisatione*, expounds the ideas of physicians of his day concerning fasting. They held that certain nervous and hysterical persons are able to live without eating, because they can maintain a balance between body-fluid and natural heat. With the eighteenth-century explanation of metabolism now outmoded, the theory of Benedict is no longer tenable, as Siwek rightly remarks. It would indeed be interesting to ask the physicians whom Pope Benedict consulted how nervousness or hysteria could maintain the balance between fluid and heat. Siwek provides no explanation for the phenomenon of fasting in Therese, but, upon stating that hysterical people sometimes exhibit aversion from food, focusses attention upon enquiry as to whether or not there is genuine fasting.

Neither does Thurston offer any natural explanation, except a vague reference to the possibility that our knowledge about the constitution of matter may perhaps change our concepts of

[13] Maurice Chideckel, "How Science Explains It," *The American Weekly* (Oct. 15, 1939). The starting point of this physician's views is the materialistic dogma that there are not, neither can there be, supernatural phenomena or miracles. Such a position is so obviously prejudiced that the very title of the article sounds like persiflage, the implication being that science is necessarily materialistic.

human metabolism in due time—a statement which prompts Fr. Thomas Pater to remark that Thurston lets "the door wide open for all of our miracles to walk out and disappear."[14]

Less vague, yet no less fantastic, are the suggestions that Buchinger presents.[15] His thought is that it might perhaps be possible for a person to feed himself by mere air, namely through sun rays penetrating the skin, or the organism receiving food from cosmic energy. Apparently not quite satisfied with these his hypotheses, he finally calls in the word of the Gospel: "Not by bread alone does man live, but every word that comes forth from the mouth of God" (*Matt.* 4: 4). After the attempt of Buchinger to explain inedia naturally in and through such an anticlimax there is little left to say, as Niedermeyer rightly observes.[16] An organism loses energy continuously, and if no new energy is supplied, the organism disintegrates. This survey forces the conclusion that no natural explanation exists for absolute, genuine and permanent fasting. If such a case exists, the only alternative left is that of resorting to preternatural or supernatural influences as explanatory.

The question therefore remains: have cases of absolute fasting existed and can the Konnersreuth case be categorized as such? Literature on the subject provides us a number of cases which seem to be indicative of prolonged, genuine, complete inedia. Some saints are said to have taken no nourishment for a remarkable period of time, as St. Libwina of Schiedam (throughout forty years), St. Nicolas von der Flüe (over twenty-two years), St. Angela of Foligno (for some twelve years), St. Catherine of Siena (eight years). Pope Benedict XIV lists a number of persons without a reputation for sanctity as does Father Thurston.[17] Occasionally the newspapers report contemporary cases of fasting but all too frequently they are out of contact for scientific

[14] *Loc. cit.*, p. 424. Pater's reference to Thurston's article is incorrect.

[15] Otto Buchinger, *Das Heilfasten und seine Hilfsmethoden* (Stuttgart: Hippocrates-Verlag, 1935), p. 46.

[16] *Op. cit.*, pp. 421, 442.

[17] Herbert Thurston, S.J., "The Case of Mollie Fancher," *The Month* (Dec. 1930); "Living Without Eating," *ibid.* (Sept., Oct., 1931). *The Physical Phenomena of Mysticism*, ed. by J. H. Crehan (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1952), pp. 294-325. See also A. Dailey, "Mollie Fancher, the Brooklyn Enigma," *The Brooklyn Eagle*, 1894.

observation. Buchinger speaks of two cases of fasting studied at the Sorbonne, yet they have never been published.[18]

Are the above instances ones of genuine and absolute fasting? The patients Thurston presents are known to have taken some nourishment, though it was very little. Fakirs belong in a different category, inasmuch as throughout their fasting they remain perfectly inactive and the period of time is generally brief. It is difficult to settle upon any conclusive evidence, for a number of reasons: a case reported somewhere in China or India or claimed as existent some hundred and more years ago is hardly available for objective scientific examination. Yet it is remarkable to note the readiness with which some authors, who rightly insist upon the strictest evidence in the case of Konnersreuth, accept the factual evidence for what they would claim to be parallel cases. The words of Deutsch, namely that we are asked to believe whereas we should rather seek to know, holds true for the parallel cases as well as for Konnersreuth. It may be added that the Church usually refuses to allow the fasting of the saints as miraculous precisely because of frequent lack of absolute evidence. If in ecclesiastical reports the fact is mentioned, the traditional "ut traditur, fertur, perhibetur, dicitur" is added.

What can be determined as regards the fasting in the case of Therese Neumann? Most of the arguments adduced become centered in establishing the fact, as to whether Therese takes or has taken nourishment over the period of years concerned. Father Siwek gives answer by stating Therese does not eat, only because she cannot eat. He would account for her condition as having its origin in an illness which makes it physically impossible for her to take food. But it is of little importance whether the woman can or cannot eat inasmuch as people who laboring under ailments cannot eat, be they hysterical or otherwise, eventually succumb. The position of several "unbelievers" is that Therese does eat. If such is true, the obvious implication is that she is an impostor. To support this opinion it is pointed out that hysterical persons have multiple ways of deceiving people. As applied to Therese Neumann, the latter statement infers that she not only evidences symptoms of phenomenological hysteria but is also of a hysterical character—a supposition yet to be proven.

[18] Quoted by Niedermeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 442.

Siwek admits that there is no "mystification préméditée" namely, premeditated deception on the part of Therese Neumann. The admission echoes the opinion of many other authors, as Naegle, Böhm, Reismann, Wunderle, Hollsteiner. But if nothing of premeditated deception exists, what further explanation is to be had? Some authors revise the fraud hypothesis inasmuch as they introduce the distinction—previously advanced by Deutsch[19]—between conscious and unconscious fraud. The supposition is that not in a conscious but subconscious state Therese Neumann takes food and drink or, as Graef would have it, in a somnabulant state. Crediting a split personality, Therese, in the state of one personality, does not remember what she accomplishes in the state of her other personality. Miss Graef seems quite satisfied with this solution. However, there is no conclusive evidence that Therese Neumann manifests a double personality. Moreover, this modified fraud hypothesis, apart from its exonerating Therese of conscious fraud, does not seem to be of much help in the solution of the problem, because we are still faced with proving the fact that Therese Neumann takes nourishment, regardless of whether she does so in a conscious or somnabulant state. Even Deutsch, who fostered the unconscious fraud hypothesis, felt that the theory of split personality is not paramount in the solution of the problem of fasting. Besides, the appeal to the unconscious can at times give the impression of a *testimonium paupertatis*. In the Konnersreuth case, it is invoked as an explanation for the bleeding phenomena, for the speaking of foreign languages and finally the status of nourishment. But is this multiple appeal to unconscious motivation more than a euphemistic phrase shielding our ignorance? The dynamics of the so-called unconscious mind themselves constitute a problem only dimly understood.

So far two indications of evidence have been adduced to prove that Therese Neumann does eat, regardless of her state of consciousness; they are of different genre, one being an objective, the other a circumstantial proof. The objective, though indirect, evidence is based on the results of chemical analyses of urine made during and after the historical two-week examination held

[19] J. Deutsch-Ph. Mazoyer, *A propos de Thérèse Neumann. Où en est actuellement l'affaire de Konnersreuth?* (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1937), pp. 41, 51, 53.

from July 13 to July 28, 1927. (The dates given by Dr. de Poray are strangely confused.) Since Therese during that period was watched day and night by four nursing nuns, placed under oath and rotating in teams of two throughout the observation, there is reasonable ground for believing that she had no opportunity to take any food. And indeed the results of the two microscopic examinations made during this same period of control confirmed that belief, inasmuch as they clearly manifested the customary symptoms associated with starvation. The analysis made two days after the observation period, however, showed traces of this kind to a lesser degree, and the results of the analysis taken a week following the latter were practically those one would expect to find in a person who normally eats and drinks. Such results serve well towards casting serious doubts upon the genuine character of the fast of Therese.

Nevertheless, there are reasons for assuming a critical attitude in regard to the foregoing results. A puzzling feature, for instance, is the existence of acetone in the urine. If present, it is one of the strongest indications of starvation. Now, the traces of acetone were very prominent in the first analysis made during the control period, whereas in the second analysis taken during that same period, namely, after another week of presumable fasting, the traces could only be described as strong. A decrease of acetone to this extent seems contradictory. One could perhaps conclude that Therese did take food sometime during the control period, yet the presumption would contradict the presence of other urinoscopic symptoms.

Moreover, during the examination period the weight of the patient was registered regularly. If she took neither food nor drink during the two-week observation, as is presumed, her weight might be expected to drop, particularly when she was known to have slept only a few hours and was quite active, accomplishing her work around the house, walking back and forth to the church always accompanied, of course, by the nurses. Twice during the control period a loss of weight appeared and in each instance it was after the Friday visions when the stigmatist loses a considerable amount of blood. The organism replaced these losses, each time, and at the finish of the observation period her weight was the same as at the beginning. Here, it has been advanced that the weight results are an absolute indication that

she did eat despite the very strict control. Such a tergiversation not only undermines the whole purpose of the examination, but also belies the urinoscopic findings and involves a *petitio principii*. If there is genuine fasting, this will precisely be evident in the fact that the body substance maintains itself without loss of weight.

In conclusion, the objective test did not yield conclusive evidence due to the fact that part of the results plead for absolute fasting and part of them are against it. Many will, therefore, require that a more prolonged examination be given and not in the home of Therese but in a hospital under the supervision of physicians. This brings us to other evidence offered as precluding the genuine character of Therese Neumann's fast.

The circumstantial evidence would extend the fraud hypothesis to those associated with Therese. Taking food, consciously or unconsciously, is an observable fact which, during the past twenty-five years of the alleged fast, must have been noticed by one or more people in her environment. Even though Therese, in a somnabulant state, may not know or remember that she takes food, someone in all those years must have noticed that food was missing. Yet all the persons in her immediate environment, her parents, brothers, sisters, relatives, acquaintances, the pastor, maintain that they never saw Therese taking nourishment, either in a conscious or somnabulant state or that food was missing. The crucial question, then, is whether we are to believe them.

The only way to test the statements of Therese Neumann and her family is another prolonged, rigorously supervised examination in some hospital or institution, and away from the home. It should be added that the claim of some physicians that this examination should necessarily or even preferably be conducted in a non-Catholic institution is preposterous, inasmuch as it implies that a Catholic environment is not to be trusted. Since 1937, not only the Bavarian hierarchy but also the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office have insisted upon an examination of this kind. One should recall that the official document issued by the Bishop of Regensburg, Dec. 10, 1937, does not express doubt as to the reliability of the examination in 1927; it states that it could only show the state of affairs in that year, but that it pro-

vides no information about the years following. For that reason a new observation is requested. The document then reports that Therese Neumann was willing to submit to a new examination; her father however, refused. Whether Therese expressed her willingness, knowing that her father would refuse, and thus is hiding behind him, is a debated point.

From this point the question about the genuine character of the fasting of Therese Neumann centers around the refusal of Therese and/or her family concurring with the express wish of these two eminent hierarchical authorities. The common and quite natural interpretation of the refusal not only concerns its implications of disobedience, but also seems a clear indication that Therese and/or her family do have something to hide. True, one may look upon the refusal from a more psychological, and, indeed, more charitable standpoint. Supposing that the Neumann family is convinced of the non-existence of fraud, one can understand that they are rightfully irritated by the continuous demands for a reiterated examination. Seen in this light, their refusal to co-operate would even constitute a favorable element, because it would indicate that the Neumanns do not care whether other people believe in their daughter or not.

Aside from these and similar extenuating considerations, the refusal of Therese and/or the family to concur with the wish of the hierarchy remains a deplorable fact, because it prevents arriving at any convincing proof concerning the crucial problem. It is here the case rests. We have thus far no incontrovertible evidence that the fasting is not genuine, even though there are certain indications that arouse suspicions. There is no convincing proof either that we are meeting here with a case of complete, constant, genuine fasting. The latter remarks may be seen to sum up both the discussions regarding fasting and the entire Konnersreuth controversy. Neither earlier nor recent works on Therese Neumann have provided incontrovertible evidence in either direction, in favor or against the supernatural character of the phenomena. The arguments furnished in recent publications do not seem to be essentially different from those advanced previously, although certain points have been clarified. It is, therefore, doubtful that recent publications settle the controversy once and for all. If they do, then the case had been settled

long ago. Controversies very likely will continue and, as a matter of fact, are still prevailing. An example thereof is that stirred up by the Graef book. Letitia Fairfield countenanced the views of Hilda Graef; Hubert Urban challenged Fairfield and Graef, the latter in turn challenged Urban, and so it may temporarily continue.[20]

It is pretty well agreed upon that ecstasies and stigmata are in themselves natural phenomena, but depending on the cause they may be supernatural. If God is their cause, He may use the psychosomatic mechanisms, present to a lower or higher degree in every person. Hence, whether the stigmata and ecstasies of Therese Neumann are natural or supernatural—diabolic influences being inadmissible—cannot be decided on their own merits, but must be based on the evidence of external criteria.

Summing up the evidence, some of it positively pleads in favor of a supernatural agency, while some is as positively against it, though most of the evidence remains negative or dubious in itself. Personal holiness is no decisive criterion.

On the credit side, there must be given due consideration to the fact that the Konnersreuth phenomena have borne spiritual fruit, while on the debit side, the alleged revelations and prophecies minimize the supernatural influences. As for the other factors invoked as criteria, it is doubtful that they ought be taken as miraculous. If we are to allow them as miracles, their factual existence is not proven.

Instead of being miraculous, there is a strong presumption that the cures from ailments are due to an hysterical condition—which, however, need not be characterological.

The spontaneous flow of blood can be natural, although the existing explanations in the Konnersreuth case are not altogether satisfactory.

If substantiated, the speaking of Aramaic or other foreign languages can perhaps be attributed to telepathic transmission.

[20] Letitia Fairfield, "Therese Neumann, An Apparent Case of Hysteria," *The Tablet*, CXCVII, 5781 (March 3, 1951), 169. Hubert J. Urban, "The Case of Therese Neumann," *ibid.*, 5792 (May 26, 1951), 422. Hilda C. Graef and Letitia Fairfield, "The Case of Therese Neumann," *ibid.*, 5794 (June 9, 1951), 462.

The gift of identifying sacred objects and clairvoyance may fall within the same pattern of explanation.

In all the foregoing, it is argued that the phenomena need not be supernatural, due to the fact that similar events are found or can be produced in persons and under circumstances reasonably excluding preternatural influences. On the other hand, the existence of analogous cases furnishes no positive proof that the supernatural origin of such phenomena must be precluded in every case. The argument *ex analogia* yields only probability. Even if the said phenomena can be duplicated naturally, it does not follow that every such case has to be explained naturally.

The phenomenon of fasting is of a different nature. If the fasting of Therese Neumann is genuine and absolute, there seems to be no other way out but to concede that natural explanations thereof are inadequate. However, in Konnersreuth so far we lack conclusive evidence as to its factual existence.

The query as to whether miracles occurring in the life of a stigmatic should be considered as performed by God, for the precise purpose of proving the divine origin of the stigmata, remains a purely academic question in the Konnersreuth case as long as there is no definite certainty as to the presence of actual miracles accompanying the given phenomena.

The attitude that seems to recommend itself concerning the happenings in Konnersreuth is one of wholesome scepticism—which, however, does not imply naturalism. Whatever may have been the position of Cardinal Faulhaber in regard to Therese Neumann in later days, his words, spoken as early as Feb. 2, 1927, still hold good: "If you speak the language of the Church, you must pass no precipitate judgment upon Konnersreuth. . . . Here is the place to repeat the words of Gamaliel. . . . 'If this work be of man, it will fall of itself; but if it be of God, you can in no wise destroy it.' With or without Konnersreuth our faith rests on a rock."

JAMES H. VAN DER VELDT, O.F.M.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

QUODLIBETAL QUESTIONS

Part III

AN ANCIENT PHRASE

Schopenhauer seemed to think that the phrase "human dignity" originated with Immanuel Kant. *More suo* he proceeded to sneer at the conception and to disparage the use that Kant and some of his followers made of it. With regard to the latter, Schopenhauer was right to indulge in sneers and criticism, for the Kantian notion of the autonomy of the moral will, making man a law unto himself, provides no true basis for moral conduct. Aside from this, it is strange that Schopenhauer, who was widely read and prided himself on his knowledge of both literature and philosophy, had never met an earlier use of the words "human dignity."

These words are at least as ancient as one of the most familiar prayers in the ordinary of the Mass. *Deus, qui humanae substantiae dignitatem mirabiliter condidisti, et mirabilius reformasti: da nobis per hujus aquae et vini mysterium, ejus divinitatis esse consortes, qui humanitatis nostrae fieri dignatus est particeps, Jesus Christus, Filius tuus, Dominus noster; qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate Spiritus Sancti Deus, per omnia saecula saeculorum.*

It is said that this prayer first appears in some of the ancient sacramentaries as a Christmas collect, without, of course, the words *per hujus aquae et vini mysterium.* In form, it is a work of the highest art. In subject-matter, it is a flawless illustration of that harmony of theology and philosophy which is the highest ideal of the greatest of Christian thinkers. For human reason as well as divine revelation tells us that all man's being and all his dignity are a wonderful work of God. From revelation alone we learn of the still more wonderful way in which man's dignity has been re-established. And to faith and reason are added the works of love and hope that are done whenever this prayer is said.

THREE PHILOSOPHERS

Philosophy has been defined as a search for the ultimate causes of things and as an attempt to give a comprehensive account of

what things are and of how and for what purpose they came to be. Certain philosophers have said that this search must end in absolute idealism, the affirmation that there is but one reality, an infinite, self-existent mind. Idealistic monism has been one of the dominant modes of thought in the modern world. Yet it can scarcely be said to offer a convincing account of things as they are or to provide a satisfying answer to the problems of life. Can this doctrine be said to have any part of the true answer, or is there any sense in which it can be accepted?

God can hardly be said to philosophize, even though Plato is credited with saying that God eternally mathematicizes. Before God, infinite, self-existent mind, brought the universe or any infinite being into existence, absolute idealism was in a sense the true philosophy. But that was before there was any need for a philosophy and before there could even be a philosophy. God, omniscience itself, knows all things in Himself and does not need to seek their causes. At best, absolute idealism is superfluous and even frivolous.

Another form of idealism is pluralistic in one sense and dualistic in another. According to this doctrine, matter is a superstition. God, the infinite spirit, exists, and beyond Him exist finite spirits and nothing else. Hence after the angels had been created, but before our universe had begun to be, pluralistic spiritualism was true. "At that time"—it was, of course, before time began—Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael, if they are to be described and classified as philosophers, were predecessors of Bishop Berkeley. Not by discursive reasoning but by intuition they saw things steadily and saw them whole. They knew that nothing was real except Almighty God and those orders of pure but finite spirits like themselves which God had made. But of Berkeleyan idealism, just as of Hegelian monism, it must be said that "when" it was true it was superfluous.

A third philosophy antedates the philosophies of Berkeley and Hegel and insists more emphatically and effectively than they do on the primacy of the spiritual. It holds that God, infinite mind, pure actuality, self-existent, eternal, one, good, and true, is the first cause and last end of all things. It recognizes the real existence of finite spiritual substances created by God's infinite power. The reality of the human soul it knows by human reason;

the angelic nature it knows from divine revelation. It likewise affirms the real existence of the material things that make up the physical universe. This philosophy is a true synthesis and a truly comprehensive view of things. It affirms the existence of the infinite one and of the finite many. It establishes the reality of matter as well as mind, of being and of becoming, of substance and accidents, of act and potency, of necessity and contingency. It is realistic and practical. It is, as Bergson admitted, the natural metaphysics of the human mind. It is the *philosophia perennis* of Plato and Aristotle, of Augustine and Anselm, of Bonaventure, Scotus, and Aquinas.

THE EXTREMIST ERROR

It is impossible to escape entirely from the truth, and few men will venture to maintain that there is no truth or that the human mind is utterly unable to know the truth. Far from being universal skeptics, most of us are inclined to be particular dogmatists. The error into which most men, even very great thinkers, are prone to fall is very different from Pyrrhonism, the denial of all truth. This more common mistake results from the fact when we discover some of the truth we are inclined to think that this is the whole truth. A man can be so drawn to the truth that he has discovered that he will say that his truth is the only truth. Some illustrations of this fallacy may be taken from the history of philosophy, particularly from the advocates of the various monistic systems.

Parmenides, the greatest of the pre-Socratic philosophers, discovered the truth that "what is," or being, is real. He then asserted that being alone is real and that becoming or change is an illusion. Heraclitus and his school found change to be an omnipresent reality in the physical universe. Next they asserted that all is becoming and that there is no being. Democritus and the atomists saw that matter is real and then affirmed that matter alone exists. The idealistic monist finds that mind is real and concludes that all reality is spiritual. The pantheist, such as Spinoza, perceives the great truth that God exists and then concludes that God alone exists. If anything is real, the pantheist maintains, it must be identified with God.

Admittedly, these thinkers did not argue in so crude and

explicit a fashion as has been expressed here. Nevertheless, this is their essential and basic error. In every monistic philosophy there is to be found this hasty generalization: "I have found this to be true. I hold this to be the whole truth." Hence this extremist error may also be called the monistic fallacy. It is at the root of every monistic philosophy.

A SIN AGAINST LOGIC

In inductive reasoning the most heinous error is hasty generalization, the illicit jump from some to all. David admitted this fault when he said, "I said in my haste, 'All men are liars.'" In big things or in little, all of us are guilty of this fallacy at some time or other—unless this too be a hasty generalization. The monistic fallacy, or extremist error, clearly falls into this class. It may also be accounted for by deductive logic. According to the traditional square of opposition, we know that if a universal affirmative, an A proposition, is true, then the corresponding particular affirmative, or I proposition, is true. If it is true, for instance, that "All Catholics are Christians," then it must be true that "Some Catholics are Christians." *E contra,* if an I proposition is true, then the corresponding A proposition is not necessarily true: it may be true or it may be false. Thus if "Some minerals are valuable," it is not licit to conclude that "All minerals must be valuable." Nor is it licit, merely on the information that "Some gold is valuable,' 'to assert that "All gold is valuable," true as that proposition happens to be. But the monistic fallacy does precisely this. Monism ascertains the truth of a particular affirmative and then asserts the truth of the corresponding universal affirmative. The essential argument of materialistic monism is this: Some real things are material. Therefore, all real things are material. The essential argument of idealistic monism is this: Some reality is spiritual. Therefore, all reality is spiritual.

Again, in deductive logic there is a process known as the conversion of propositions. Given that "No Americans are kings," it follows that "No kings are Americans." Given that "Some Italians are artists," we may assert also that "Some artists are Italians." But given that "All dictators are men," we can conclude only that "Some men are dictators." To assert that "All men are dictators" would be an instance of the fallacy of illicit conversion.

In ordinary thought we do not commit this gross and crude fallacy, but it may be charged that certain great philosophers have done so. In the last analysis this is the way the monistic argument runs: "Material things are real; therefore, all reality is matter." Or again: "Mind is real; therefore, whatever is real is mind." As in hasty generalization, so also in illicit conversion and in the misuse of the square of opposition, there is an unjustified leap from some to all, from the particular to the universal. The three fallacies are at bottom one, and they give evidence that even in fallacies there is not that boundless gulf between deduction and induction that some modern logicians have fancied to exist.

ADVICE TO KINGS

It is worth recalling that in his dedication of *The Prince* to Lorenzo de' Medici, Machiavelli states that it is not his purpose to describe an imaginary ruler in a nonexistent realm. He holds that he is rather the realist who will describe what is the character and what are the deeds of real rulers, and especially successful rulers. One of the theses insisted upon by Machiavelli is that the prince should strive to find out exactly what he is able to do. If he finds that he is unequal to waging a successful war of conquest, then he should by all means refrain from starting such a war. On the other hand, a prince may be sure that he is strong enough to invade a neighboring kingdom, to defeat its armies, to destroy the former ruling family root and branch, and to set himself up in their stead. If all this is what the prince finds he can do with success, then this is what he ought to do. Hence Machiavelli reverses the Pythagorean maxim, "For Can dwells ever nigh to Must," and makes it read, "For Must dwells ever nigh to Can." Might, he says in effect, makes right. More than that, might makes duty as well.

Machiavelli was in disgrace and in exile from court when he wrote *The Prince*. In those same years an English contemporary was high in the service of a more powerful prince than Lorenzo de' Medici. There are both parallels and contrasts between Machiavelli and Thomas More, this other man of the renaissance. Like Machiavelli, St. Thomas More was a statesman and diplomat, a political philosopher, a writer, and a humanist, although in all these ways, as well as in his character as a man, More was vastly

the greater. A particularly striking and important point of contrast is related by More's son-in-law, William Roper, in *The Mirror of Virtue in Worldly Greatness, or the Life of Sir Thomas More, Knight.* "Now upon this resignment of his office, came Sir Thomas Cromwell, then in the king's high favor, to Chelsea to him with a message from the king. Wherein when they had thoroughly communed together, 'Master Cromwell,' quoth he, 'you are now entered into the service of a most noble, wise, and liberal prince; if you will follow my poor advice, you shall, in your counsel-giving to his grace, ever tell him what he ought to do, but never what he is able to do. So shall you show yourself a true faithful servant, and a right wise and worthy counselor. For if a lion knew his own strength, hard were it for any man to rule him.' "

It is the record of modern history that the princes have listened to the Machiavellis rather than to the Mores. This record likewise provides evidence for us to decide which man's advice is the better. How right St. Thomas More was and how wrong was Nicoló Machiavelli may be seen from the collapse of kingdoms and empires, from the disasters that have come upon our world, and from the still greater calamities that threaten it.

JOHN K. RYAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

UNITY OF THE CHURCH

[The] unity of the one Church is not some indefinite sentiment, but a concrete reality corporately embodied in a visibly constituted society. It is closely knit together by intellectual and moral bonds actuated by the perpetual presence of the Holy Ghost. . . . If the Church is one society, it must be one in the social collaboration of its members pursuing the same goal under the same head. It must, likewise, not only be materially visible as a society of Christians, but formally visible as the one society of Christ. Visible unity is not a mere *desideratum,* but a patent fact deriving from the very essence of the Church itself.

—Edward Francis Hanahoe, S.A., *Catholic Ecumenism* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953), p. 77.

Answers to Questions

THE PROBLEM OF OVERPOPULATION

Question 1: If a country becomes very densely populated, would all the married couples have a sufficient reason to practice Rhythm, at least if they have had two or three children, in order to relieve the congestion?

Question 2: Would there be an obligation in social justice binding married couples in such a case to practice Rhythm (or to observe complete abstinence) in order that the population problem might not be aggravated still more?

Question 3: Would priests in such a situation be allowed to give instructions on the moral aspect of Rhythm and to recommend it?

Answer 1: When a country becomes so densely populated that the citizens can no longer obtain the means for a decent livelihood, an obligation of charity and social justice rests on other nations possessing unused territory to admit some of the people of the congested nation. However, if the situation is not met in this way, and the crowded people are unable to find living room outside their own boundaries, married couples would surely be justified in practicing Rhythm (or observing complete continence) in order to cut down the increase in population. It must be emphasized, however, that the use of Rhythm is ordinarily licit only when both husband and wife agree to employ it, and when they both can and will practice continence during the fertile periods.

Answer 2: The right of a married couple to conjugal intercourse is so sacred and involves spiritual factors so important, that one must be very hesitant to assert that a couple has not a right to the marriage act whenever they wish because the good of society takes precedence. Hence, it would seem that married couples may exercise their right and have more children even in a land in which crowded conditions render an increase of population very undesirable.

Answer 3: In a situation such as is pictured by the questioner a priest could surely give information on the moral aspect of Rhythm to those having a right to such information—married persons and those preparing for marriage. He could even recommend the use of Rhythm, at least to couples having several children. But he should make it clear that this is not an obligation, and that Rhythm may not be used if it proves an occasion of incontinence.

MILK FOR BAPTISM

Question: Why cannot milk be used (in a case of necessity when water is not available) for the administration of Baptism, since by chemical analysis milk is found to be composed of a great proportion of water?

Answer: The Church has defined that true and natural water is necessary for the administration of the sacrament of Baptism (*DB*, 858). Theologians admit that the validity of the sacrament is not impaired if a small quantity of extraneous matter is mixed with the water, as long as the average person would still look on it as water. Thus, ocean water, containing salt and other substances in a slight proportion, could be used for the valid administration of Baptism. On the other hand, it is commonly taught that in judging what can be classified as water the *usus vulgaris* or common estimate of ordinary persons, rather than chemical analysis, is the determining norm. Even though a liquid, chemically analyzed, is found to be in great proportion water, it cannot be used—at least, as certain matter of Baptism—unless people commonly regard it as water, suitable for ablutions (since it is through the ablution of the recipient, signifying purification, that this sacrament confers its effects). For this reason, milk cannot be considered valid matter of Baptism, even when a person is in danger of death, and no water is available. At most, skim-milk might be used for a conditional administration of the sacrament.

Billuart expresses this doctrine well. He says: "Baptism can be conferred in any kind of water, however modified, as long as the nature of water is not destroyed; but if the nature of water is destroyed, Baptism cannot be given. We understand the nature

of Baptism more according to the common use and estimate of men than according to physical laws. . . . Hence, Baptism is invalid if conferred with mud, wine, thick beer, milk, oil, saliva, sweat, tears, etc., because all these are not regarded as natural water, whether they differ from it in physical nature or not" (*Tractatus de baptismo*, Diss. I, art. 3).

THE EXCISION OF EXTRA ORGANS

Question 1: If a woman has two wombs (as happens sometimes) is she permitted to have one of the wombs removed by surgery, as well as any extra ovaries that may be found?

Question 2: If the surgeon discovered that each of the two wombs has two ovaries, would he be allowed to ligate the tubes leading to one of the wombs, instead of excising it, on the ground that this is a simpler way of rendering the woman capable of conceiving in only one womb, like a normal female?

Answer 1: It would seem to be lawful to excise extra organs or members of the body for the purpose of rendering a person physically normal. Hence, in the case presented, a surgeon would be allowed to remove the extra womb, as well as extra ovaries. A moral difficulty could indeed be found in the fact that such an operation would be by its nature a sterilizing operation, and would actually effect what might be called a "semi-sterilization" of the particular woman. However, the principle of the double effect could be legitimately applied to the situation, since the good effect, the normalization of the woman, would sufficiently compensate for the bad effect, the excision of a healthy sex organ, with the resultant "semi-sterilization."

Answer 2: The ligation of the tubes, to prevent the functioning of one womb, would be unlawful. For in such a procedure the only immediate effect would be the sterilization of the woman with respect to the womb with which these tubes are connected. Hence, since there is no good effect that is equally immediate, the operation would be unjustifiable. Even though the final result would be to render the woman capable of conceiving in only one womb, like a normal female, the means to produce this result would be a procedure that by its own nature is merely an act of sterilization.

THE LAWYER AND MASS BEQUESTS

Question: What advice could suitably be given to a lawyer in reference to the drawing up of wills which contain bequests for Masses?

Answer: Every Catholic lawyer should be told that in drawing up a will containing a bequest for Masses he should advise the client to be most explicit and detailed in expressing his intention. The client should designate the priest or religious group to whom the bequest is to be transmitted, and also the particular ends for which the Masses are to be offered. Above all, he should make it clear whether he wishes High Masses or Low Masses, and how many of each he wishes to be celebrated. If all lawyers regarded it as their duty to bring these points to the attention of clients desirous of making a Mass bequest, priests would be spared the uncertainty and the anxiety which they experience when they receive a large bequest with no more information than that it is stipends for the celebration of Masses.

SOLEMN BAPTISM IN A PRIVATE HOME

Question: Canon Law forbids the administration of solemn Baptism in private homes except in certain adjuncts (Can. 776). Does the expression "solemn Baptism" include the rite prescribed for the baptism of infants, or only the lengthy ceremony prescribed for adults?

Answer: Solemn Baptism is defined as that which is administered with all the rites and ceremonies prescribed in the ritual (Can. 737, §2); hence the expression evidently includes the ritual form used for infants as well as that which is intended for adults. Both forms are forbidden in private homes, except in the circumstances designated in Canon 776. However, Canon 759, §1, prescribes that when Baptism is conferred privately in danger of death by a priest or a deacon, those ceremonies are added (if time permits) which in the solemn rite follow the essential sacramental ceremony—that is, the anointing with chrism and the conferring of the white garment and of the candle.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

HOLY SATURDAY CEREMONY

Question: Does the priest on Holy Saturday (officiating at the blessings alone without deacon or subdeacon) put on or use the dalmatic for the singing of the "Lumen Christi"? Or does he wear the cope or neither dalmatic nor cope?

Answer: According to the ceremony books for Holy Saturday the celebrant removes the purple cope after the various blessings and puts on a white maniple, deacon's stole, and dalmatic. In the absence of a white dalmatic the celebrant does not wear a chasuble instead but vests only with the white maniple and white stole over the alb. The stole is to be worn deacon style.

HOLY COMMUNION ON HOLY SATURDAY

Question: What about people receiving Holy Communion on Holy Saturday immediately after Mass? Often it has happened at our church that due to the large number of confessions some of the people are not able to receive at Communion time. May they receive immediately after Mass?

Answer: Fr. Laurence J. O'Connell (*Holy Week in Large and Small Churches*) states that "immediately after Mass means that there must be some moral union with the Mass." Davis (III, 231) says that this moral union would probably be present until ten minutes after Mass.

LEONINE PRAYERS

Question: When the celebrant leaves the altar and another religious or pious ceremony is to follow the Mass, does one fulfill the precept by having a second priest recite the Leonine prayers?

Answer: If a religious ceremony or some sacred or pious function follows immediately upon the conclusion of Mass, the celebrant of the Mass may be justified in omitting the Leonine prayers. All of the regulation and decision regarding the Leonine prayers take it for granted that the one reciting the prayers is no other than the priest who has just finished offering Holy Mass.

ORDO TO BE FOLLOWED

Question: Recently I visited in another diocese and found that on the first morning I offered Mass there was a difference in Ordos. I followed the Ordo of my home diocese but was corrected later on. Was I right or wrong?

Answer: The general rule is to follow the Ordo of the place where you are offering Holy Mass. Even if you should be offering the Holy Sacrifice in a church entrusted to a religious order, their Ordo is to be followed. So our inquirer was wrong in following his own diocesan Ordo outside of his own diocese.

PAPAL CHAMBERLAIN DRESS

Question: What is the correct dress for a papal chamberlain when he is performing some function as a public blessing or preaching? Does he wear a purple or black pompon on his biretta?

Answer: A papal chamberlain when called upon to help distribute Holy Communion or perform some other sacred function removes the mantellone and wears a surplice over the cassock. His biretta is to be adorned with a purple pompon and not a black one.

NAME OF WHICH BISHOP IN BREVIARY *PRECES?*

Question: I have been residing in another diocese for a few months on a special assignment. In the recitation of the *preces* which occurs at Lauds and Vespers should I mention the name of my own Ordinary or the Ordinary of the place where I am residing?

Answer: Stercky in his Ceremonial tells us that at the verse "Oremus et pro Antistite nostro N . . .," which occurs in the ferial *preces* of Lauds and Vespers the name of the Bishop of the diocese to which one is attached is inserted.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Book Reviews

SIX SOCIAL DOCUMENTS OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII. Huntington, Ind.: Our Sunday Visitor Press, 1953. Pp. 60.

Deeply are we indebted to the editor, modestly anonymous, who has selected and made available in English these six statements of the present Holy Father on current social questions, together with a letter of His Excellency, Monsignor Montini.

In view of the ever-changing patterns of society and the new problems which such changes present, especially in this post-war period, it is important to keep abreast of the current expositions of social thought by the Holy See wherein are found the applications of the constant teaching of the Church to the new problems which arise from day to day. Those whose interest lies in this field (and since all should be interested in Catholic Action, all should be interested in this field) will find here the latest answers to the problems which are demanding solution in this second phase of the struggle for social justice.

The first phase, the attempt to solve the labor question: the distress of the proletariat and the problem of lifting this class of society, defenselessly exposed to the vicissitudes of the economic situation, to a status equal to that of other classes and endowed with clearly defined rights, has been solved, at least in its essentials, the Holy Father says.

The second phase of the social dispute, he says, confronts us with problems and tasks of a different nature. Some of them are the overcoming of the class struggle by an organic co-ordination of employers who realize that industry is more than a mere means of earning a livelihood and their employees; the protection of the individual and the family against their absorption by the mechanistic state with its depersonalizing influences; eliminating the contrast between wealth with excessive spending for luxuries, and poverty.

The letter of Monsignor Montini, dated Sept. 22, 1952, and addressed to the Archbishop of Genoa, Cardinal Siri, summarizes many papal pronouncements on the relationship existing between the machine and the laborer, the juridico-social position of the laborers, the relationship between the enterprise and the State, all very important social questions today.

The pamphlet is enriched with a reproduction of the manuscript text, in the handwriting of His Holiness, of the address to the U. C. I. D.

No one who wishes to be up-to-date on papal teaching on the social question can afford to overlook this publication, nor can he fail to thank those who have made available this collection of papal statements.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

BLACK ROBES IN LOWER CALIFORNIA. By Peter Masten Dunne, S.J. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952. Pp. 540. $6.50.

Herbert Eugene Bolton, the late Western historian, pointed out in 1936 that the imposing stature of the Jesuits in New France was widely known because they had Parkman as their historian, whereas the Spanish Jesuits in North America had not yet been so fortunate. Since that time, Father Dunne has published four scholarly monographs relating the history of the Jesuit missions of colonial Mexico and California. This latest volume narrates the story of Jesuit labors in Baja California from 1697 until the expulsion of the Black Robes from New Spain in 1768.

The initial settlement of Lower California was encouraged by Fr. Eusebio Francisco Kino and carried out by Fr. Juan Salvatierra. Beginning from Loreto, the administrative center, and spreading both north and south, the Jesuits had, by 1768, established seventeen missions and countless visitas extending from San Jose del Cabo at the tip of the peninsula to Santa Maria in the north. The whole development was characterized both by a constant struggle for subsistence and by friction between the missionaries and the Spaniards who were interested primarily in the possibilities of pearl fishing or mining.

A concomitant of the work of expansion was exploration. To the north, the Jesuits searched in vain for a practicable land route over which supplies might be brought from Sonora and Sinaloa. Other expeditions took the Black Robes to the west coast in search of a suitable port which would serve as a supply base for the Manila galleon. Both undertakings failed, but the expeditions of Kino, Salvatierra and Fernando Consag place them among the greatest of California explorers.

Father Dunne's narrative makes it eminently clear that the missions of Baja California were established only with great difficulty. The missionaries found a desolate and barren land inhabited by natives of the lowest mentality; they were separated from their base of supplies by a gulf swept by hurricanes; they lacked ships, supplies and money. The Pious Fund and hardworking procurators solved the financial problem, but transportation difficulties continued long after the fund